FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Eastern Europe

Vol II No 021 *31 January 1986*

BULGARIA

Doynov, Zhivkov Meet USSR's Silayev; Pact Signed C 1
Economic, Sci-Tech Accords Finalized With France C 2
State Council Decrees Award for CPSU's Vorotnikov C 2
[RABOTNICHESKO DELO 20 Jan]

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Husak Holds Talks With GDR's Guenter Mittag D 1
Jakes Meets Mittag D 1
Bilak Receives LCY Central Committee Delegation D 1

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

UK Labor Party's Healey Confers With Honecker E 1
Exchanges With Sindermann, Fischer E 2
Fischer, USSR's Kapitsa View Soviet Peace Program E 3
Iraqi Planning Minister Meets Schuerer, Kleiber E 3
Reagan Thanks Honecker for Gander Crash Condolences E 3

HUNGARY

Szuros Queried on International Issues F 1

POLAND

Operation Red Flag 'Reminiscent of Real War' G 1
[Stankiewicz]
Orzechowski Makes Foreign Policy Report to Sejm G 1
LATE REPORT: Shuttle Crew 'Participants' in SDI G 15
[Sarosiek in ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI 29 Jan]

YUGOSLAVIA

LCY's Vidic Examines Gorbachev Arms Proposals I 1
[POLITIKA 22 Jan]
Veterans' Organization Debates Critical Analysis I 3
[Tomic]
More on Debate I 4
[Tomic]
Zarkovic Outlines Congress Preparations I 5
Trade Deficit Reduced; Credit Obligations Met I 8
Conditions Placed on Export, Import Firms I 8

DOYNOV, ZHIVKOV MEET USSR'S SILAYEV; PACT SIGNED

AU301951 Sofia BTA in English 1851 GMT 30 Jan 86

["New Bulgaro-Soviet Enterprise" -- BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, January 30 (BTA) -- Today, Mr. Ognyan Doynov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CC of the BCP, chairman of the Economic Council with the Council of Ministers and minister of mechanical engineering, and Mr. Ivan Silayev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, signed an agreement here, on establishing of Bulgaro-Soviet enterprise for joint production of automobile electronic systems and their components.

"A beginning of qualitatively new stage of the carrying out of the course of the BCP and the CPSU toward allaround cooperation and getting closer of the two fraternal peoples," this was the assessment given by Mr. Ognyan Doynov to the new corporation, which represents an entirely new form of integration. This type of organization will supply the possibility for joining the efforts of the two countries and on the basis of the existing joint developments they will organize the production of modern electronic systems providing lower fuel consumption of the Soviet cars and increasing their safety and comfort.

The joint enterprise will be built in Bulgaria with joint investments and will have its own design and technology bureau. The production of industrial pilot series will be organized on the basis of the existing capacities, including electronic devices, controlling, measurement and diagnostics apparatuses, for the Soviet automative industry.

[Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian at 1831 GMT on 30 January carries the same report, adding: "Comrades Chudomir Aleksandrov and Stoyan Markov were present at the signing."]

In the afternoon, Mr. Todor Zhivkov, secretary general of the CC of the BCP and president of the State Council of Bulgaria, received Mr. Ivan Silayev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

In a cordial and business-like atmosphere, they discussed issues of the fruitful and dynamically developing cooperation betwsen Bulgaria and the USSR. They paid special attention to the development and deepening of the bilateral relations in the field of mechanical engineering. The two sides stressed the significance of the joint scientific and production enterprises as an important step toward the implementation of the Long Term Programme for Development of the Economic and Techno-Scientific Cooperation between the two countries till the year 2000.

MR. Ivan Silayev was also received by Mr. Grisha Filipov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria.

ECONOMIC, SCI-TECH ACCORDS FINALIZED WITH FRANCE

AU302038 Sofia BTA in English 2011 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Paris, January 30 (BTA) -- Today, the 13th Session of the Bulgaro-French Committee for Economic and Techno-Scientific Cooperation completed its work here.

The session was presided by Mr. Andrey Lukanov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria, and Mrs. Edith Cresson, Minister of foreign trade and industrial development of France.

After an exceptionally useful exchange of views on issues of bilateral economic cooperation Mr. Andrey Lukanov and Mrs. Edith Cresson signed the following documents: a ten-year agreement for economic and techno-scientific cooperation between the Governments of Bulgaria and France, a five year programme for the priority projects and branches of cooperation between the two countries, and a protocol on the work of the session.

The two sides signed also an agreement for cooperation between the Bulgarian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the French National Center for Foreign Trade.

The new-long agreement and the programme represent the stage which has been reached in the development of trade and economic relations, as well as the spheres for future cooperation, including: power generation, metallurgy, telecommunications and automatization of the production processes, biotechnologies, food, wine and tobacco industries, and construction of small site enterprises.

The high assessment to the economic possibilities of Bulgaria was confirmed at the meeting between the Bulgarian delegation and representatives of the French business circles, which was attended by more than 100 managers of firms and organizations, among them a number of world famous banks and concerns.

The significance of the present session of the joint Bulgaro-French Committee for Economic and Techno-Scientific Cooperation, and the importance of the trade relations between Bulgaria and France was stressed at the meeting between Mr. Andrey Lukanov and Mr. Roland Dumas, minister for external relations of France, and Mr. Louis Mexandeau, minister of communications.

STATE COUNCIL DECREES AWARD FOR CPSU'S VOROTNIKOV

AU221437 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 20 Jan 86 p 1

[Text] The State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, on the basis of Article 93, item 23 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, decrees the following:

It awards Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the "Georgi Dimitrov" order for high contribution to deepening the cooperation between the BCP and the CPSU and Bulgarian-Soviet friendship, to the comprehensive bringing together of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and in connection with his 60th birthday.

Todor Zhivkov, chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria

Nikola Manolov, secretary of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria

HUSAK HOLDS TALKS WITH GDR'S GUENTER MITTAG

LD302108 Prague CTK in English 1642 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Prague, Jan 30 (CTK) -- Czechoslovak Communist Party General Secretary and President Gustav Husak received here today Politburo member and Central Committee secretary of the GDR Socialist Unity Party Guenter Mittag who is on a brief working visit to Czechoslovakia.

They praised the high level of relations between the two fraternal parties, all-round contacts between the two countries and discussed topical aspects of cooperation in foreign policy. They also expressed readiness to deepen the political, economic and scientific-technological cooperation in the interest of early progress in socio-economic development fo Czechoslovakia and the GDR. Results of the friendly working meeting of the highest representatives of both countries which took party in November 1985 in Berlin are an impulse to these efforts, they agreed.

Jakes Meets Mittag

LD302111 Prague Television Service in Czech and Slovak 1830 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Excerpts] A meeting between Milos Jakes and Genter Mittag took place today. They talked about preparations for the congresses of the two parties and the economic situation in Czechoslovakia and the GDR, as well as implementation of the program of economic and scientific-technological cooperation between the two countries up to the year 2000. They discussed a number of topics concerning improving the mutually advantageous cooperation and specialization. Guenter Mittag ended his visit to Czechoslovakia this afternoon.

BILAK RECEIVES LCY CENTRAL COMMITTEE DELEGATION

LD302044 Prague Domestic Service in Czech and Slovak 1700 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Vasil Bilak, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, today received a delegation of the LCY Central Committee, led by Aleksandr Sekulovic, head of its Commission for International Cooperation. At the meeting they praised the development of relations and cooperation, and discussed questions of further deepening the exchange of experiences between the CPCZ and the LCY.

UK LABOR PARTY'S HEALEY CONFERS WITH HONECKER

LD302036 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1553 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Berlin, 30 Jan (ADN) -- Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, received Denis Healey, member of the Shadow Cabinet and foreign affairs spokesman of the British Labor Party, in the State Council Building today.

The friendly and open exchange of views centered on topical questions concerning the international situation, the policy of the two parties, and relations between the GDR and Great Britain.

Erich Honecker and Denis Healey agreed in noting that in the nuclear age the course of peaceful coexistence is more than ever a dictate of reason. Despite differing social orders, alliance systems, philosophies, and religions it is necessary to learn to live with one another and to get along well together.

The partners in the talks stressed that in view of the continuing tense situation in the world, the danger of a nuclear inferno must be removed and a change toward detente and disarmament must be achieved through increased efforts by all forces interested in peace. The supreme goal must be to prevent an arms race in space and to end it on earth, to limit, reduce, and finally eliminate nuclear armaments, and strengthen strategic stability. All states, all political and social forces should make their contribution to this. The role of the socialist, communist, and social democratic workers' movements in the states concerned also has increasing significance in this, and international understanding between them should be promoted.

Erich Honecker and Denis Healey gave a positive assessment of the results of the Geneva Summit between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. As a result of that meeting, more favorable preconditions have been created for the solution of the most pressing problems for the whole of mankind -- those of war and peace. It is now necessary to achieve the goals agreed upon at the summit meeting through concrete agreements on arms limitation and disarmament, particularly on the prevention of the militarization of space and a radical reduction in nuclear armaments. An agreement on a moratorium for all nuclear tests would have great significance.

In this connection Erich Honecker referred to the Soviet Union's new and comprehensive proposals, submitted a few days ago by Comrade Gorbachev, for freeing the world from nuclear weapons, which have met with an extraordinary international echo and have been received by the people of the GDR with great agreement, pleasure and satisfaction.

No one would lose by the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons; international security would be decisively strengthened. The Soviet Union's offer of negotiations is a realistic, viable way to arms limitation and disarmament. Whoever really wants elimination of nuclear weapons must not create new and extremely dangerous space strike weapons.

Denis Healey explained in detail the foreign policy strategy of the Labor Party, which is working for the development of equal cooperation between states with different social systems on the basis of the final statement agreed on in Helsinki in 1975. He reaffirmed the Labor Party's view that a complete ban on tests of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and a halt to deployment of new types of nuclear weapons must be the basis for negotiations on reducing nuclear weapon arsenals.

Denis Healey welcomed the extension by the USSR of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear weapon tests and expressed hope that all other states possessing nuclear weapons will follow this example so that, in this way, the basis for an all-embracing test ban agreement will be created. He believes that Mikhail Gorbachev's latest proposals merit a positive reaction from the Western governments. The final abolition of all nuclear weapons would also require an agreement on substantial reductions in conventional forces and the lessening of political tensions.

Denis Healey suggested that meanwhile conventional defense concepts which do not cause reciprocal provocation should be developed by the two military groupings in Europe. An early, positive conclusion of the negotiations in Vienna and Stockholm would speed up this process.

Erich Honecker spoke about the development of the GDR and preparations for the 11th SED Congress.

The two men emphasized the usefulness of dialogue between the SED and the Labor Party and spoke in favor of continuing the contacts between the two parties. They supported the expansion of relations between the GDR and Britain in the political, economic, scientific-technical, cultural, and humanitarian spheres.

Taking part in the meeting in the GDR Council of State were Hermann Axen, Politburo member and secretary of the SED Central Committee, and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the People's Chamber of the GDR; Heinz Eichler, secretary of the Council of State; and Len Scott, Denis Healey's personal adviser.

Exchanges With Sindermann, Fischer

LD302048 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1726 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Berlin, 30 Jan (ADN) -- Denis Healey, member of the Shadow Cabinet and foreign policy spokesman of the Labor Party, was received at the People's Chamber today by Horst Sindermann, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and People's Chamber president.

In the talk, which took place in a frank and open atmosphere, current international problems and questions concerning relations between the two states' parliaments were discussed. The two sides stressed the great responsibility attached to cooperation among deputies in preserving peace and building confidence.

Horst Sindermann noted that the continuing tense situation in the world requires that the forces of realism and reason unite in order to avert a nuclear inferno and preserve peace, end the arms race on earth and prevent it spreading to space.

Horst Sindermann and Denis Healey welcomed the results of the Geneva meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, as an important step forward. The disarmament program proposed by the USSR for freeing mankind from nuclear weapons is in keeping with the spirit of the Geneva meeting.

Also today, Denis Healey was received by GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer. Oskar Fischer outlined the GDR's wide-ranging efforts for a change to detente in international relations and for peaceful cooperation among states. Oskar Fischer and Denis Healey agreed that what is important above all is to avert the danger of nuclear war, not to allow the militarization of space, to halt the arms race on earth, and to achieve real disarmament steps.

FISHER, USSR'S KAPITSA VIEW SOVIET PEACE PROGRAM

LD302102 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1801 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Berlin, 30 Jan (ADN) -- GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer and USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Mikhail Kapitsa discussed topical questions concerning cooperation between the socialist states in Berlin today.

The two politicians agreed that everything must be done to end the arms race on earth and to prevent the "star wars" plans. The latest comprehensive Soviet peace program opened up for the first time the concrete chance to free the world of nuclear weapons by the end of the century. For this it was worth exerting all one's strength, the two men stressed.

Kapitsa is currently in the GDR for consultations.

IRAQI PLANNING MINISTER MEETS SCHUERER, KLEIBER

LD302239 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 2111 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Berlin, 30 Jan (ADN) -- The GDR and Iraq today signed an agreement on cooperation between their central planning bodies. Gerhard Schuerer, GDR deputy premier and chairman of the State Planning Commission, and Dr Samal Majid Faraj, Iraqi minister for planning, praised this step as an important contribution to the deepening of economic relations between the two countries.

Dr Samal Majid Faraj, during his meeting with GDR Premier Willi Stoph, had an extensive exchange of views on international issues and bilateral cooperation. Both sides expressed their interest in an expansion of economic and trade relations.

Guenther Kleiber, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the GDR side of the GDR-Iraqi Standing Committee, and Claus Gaedt, deputy foreign trade minister, discussed the state of and prospects for economic cooperation with the Iraqi politician.

During his stay, which ended today, Dr Samal Majid Faraj visited the Robotron combine in Dresden and the SED Central Committee Central Institute for Socialist Economic Management.

REAGAN THANKS HONECKER FOR GANDER CRASH CONDOLENCES

LD302027 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1704 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Berlin -- U.S. President Ronald Reagan has expressed thanks for the message of condolences from GDR Council of State Chairman Erich Honecker on the tragic airplane crash in Newfoundland. Altogether 258 U.S. citizens were killed in the accident at Gander last December.

The message from U.S. President Ronald Reagan states: "Esteemed Mr Chairman, I thank you for your friendly message of condolences. This tragedy affected us painfully. All too often it is only after a loss such as this that we learn to value the worth of human contacts."

SZUROS QUERIED ON INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

LD281350 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1815 GMT 27 Jan 86

["Radio Diary" phone-in program presented by unidentified moderator with journalists Eva Szecsi and Gyorgy Bolgar and program guest MSZMP Central Committee Secretary Matyas Szuros -- live]

[Text] [Szecsi] A great many questions have come in since 1500 [1400 GMT]. I shall give some of these in brief; as headlines. What can be expected after Geneva, Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals, local crises, and terrorism. We have received, naturally, a great many questions about Hungarian foreign policy. These questions were addressed to Matyas Szuros. Our relationship with neighboring countries, Hungarian-Romanian relations, the situation of the Hungarian national minority in Romania, joint investments (?in) the Bos-Nagymaros power station, and so forth.

I think that you are not surprised that so many questions on so many subjects have been asked.

[Szuros] The world situation is rather complex and therefore it is understandable that there are so many questions.

[Szecsi] Well, I think that we shall touch on these in detail, but if you allow me, first of all I would like to show that we, too, have made preparations. You have been a guest of "Radio Diary" twice before. In 1984, 2 years ago, when asked whether you were optimistic about the future you answered that you were a realist and therefore moderately optimistic. At the beginning of 1985, however, you said that you felt that we were at a crossroads; 1985 could be, perhaps, a decisive year. Well, now at the beginning of 1986 what is your view? Was this assessment of 1985 a correct one?

[Szuros] Yes, I really used these expressions last year because the arms race had reached such a level that mankind is being threatened by such great dangers that action is undoubtedly needed. Well, I can say that the situation in 1985 was less tense, the international atmosphere was less then than, let us say, for example, in 1984, or, as it happens, at the turn of 1983-84 when, as a result of the deployment of U.S. missiles in Western Europe, the situation became extraordinarily edgy.

What is really at issue here? The situation that evolved last year in the Soviet Union and in the socialist countries gave reason for hope. In my opinion the series of changes in terms of the internal and external policies which are taking place in the Soviet Union are of particularly decisive importance. I could define this also by saying that this new style and new line of activity which have unfolded in the Soviet Union and, as it happens, in its foreign policy; the dynamism to such a large extent, readiness to initiate, led to the summit.

[Bolgar interrupts] The Soviet-U.S. summit...

[Szuros] Yes, I am thinking of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva which justified our hopes really, although we emphasized even then that we had no illusions. In the framework of one summit it is impossible to solve with one stroke huge questions of international historical importance. What is said, however, is that really in the most dangerous issue of our age, in arms limitation and in disarmament there has been no substantive progress although certain possibilities and changes are more viable today than at the beginning of 1985, let us say.

[Bolgar] In other words, it is rather difficult to say, either with hindsight or by prediction, that the year may be a decisive one, but nonetheless it was a fundamental change in that the period of cool relations between the United States and the Soviet Union ended and top-level negotiations began.

[Szuros] The Soviet-U.S. Geneva summit is in itself of historic importance, and I would say simply that out of that meeting maximum achievement was derived which could be imagined under the present international conditions. The joint statement is of particularly great significance. For what is at issue here?

Perhaps it is worth contemplating a little how we stand in the world in general. It is possible that it appears well-known to you but still it is a historical fact, a reality that socialism and capitalism exist alongside each other. It has been proven that socialism cannot be wiped off the earth by force of arms. It is also true most certainly that the collapse of capitalist society as a system cannot be expected to occur soon. In other words, coexistence is necessary in the historical long term. Second, as a result of the arms race, particularly due to the weapons of great destructive power, a new situation has come about. Certain ancient truths have collapsed; for example the one quoted by Zagladin in his interview in NEPSZABADSAG: If you want peace prepare for war. Or, for example, the interpretation of just and unjust wars also appears different, and so on.

[Bolgar] Without interrupting you I would like to call the listeners' attention to the fact that we are already halfway through this subject. So, what is at issue here, ultimately, is the extent to which the well-being of the Hungarian listener, the Hungarian subject, is influenced by the shaping of foreign policy, of international politics. In this respect our optimism and pessimism are evoked primarily by the way East-West relations develop and the way Soviet-U.S. relations develop. So, in that light, how did these develop after all in 1985 and, in view of what you just said, how do they appear to be developing this year, not long after the Geneva summit and perhaps not long before another Soviet-U.S. summit?

[Szecsi] To make the answer more difficult and to make the question more complicated: Mikhail Gorbachev's new disarmament proposal was voiced after the Geneva summit. I think the essence of that -- and we may summarize it, however roughly -- is that within 15 years a world free of nuclear weapons must be created. Now, this occurred after Geneva. To what extent can it influence the subsequent development of relations?

[Szuros] Yes, returning to the line of thought I spoke about just now, it is extraordinarily important that action is needed in this situation precisely as a result of the initiatives and efforts of Soviet foreign policy. An improvement has taken place in Soviet-U.S. relations as well. These have produced concrete results, partly in atmosphere, and I think that by now even Reagan believes perhaps that Gorbachev does not want war and that in the United States and elsewhere in the world where there has been doubt in this respect before it may be increasingly believed that the Soviet Union does not want war. In this connection the disarmament proposal program and arms limitation to the year 2000 presented by the Soviet Union on 15 and 16 January is of great significance since it is this road on which we, mankind, must tread because preparations for war and increased armaments do not enhance security and the chances of peace but have the contrary effect.

Well, two concepts are in opposition: the much-nurtured dream of President Reagan and part of the leading circles is the so-called SDI, the creation and deployment in space of an antimissile system which can eliminate the effectiveness and role of strategic offensive missiles. Well, such a comprehensive program proposal in my opinion. . .

[Bolgar interrupts] This refers largely to the Soviet program proposal which is in contrast to this space defense initiative, and advocates that all kinds of nuclear weapons should be destroyed and then there will be no need for space weapons either. It is in this aspect that the two concepts are in opposition.

[Szuros] Yes, this is what it is all about, these are two different concepts and it can be said that they are conflicting ones. However, perhaps for the sake of our listeners it would be rational to briefly summarize what is at issue here. First of all I would like to emphasize that it is a good basis for negotiations, in my opinion, for it must be kept in view that, in today's world, compromise solutions and agreements may be realized. This Soviet package, therefore, the totality of proposals, takes into account the viewpoints and interests of the other side as well as that of mankind and approaches from many points of view the previous U.S. standpoints.

[Moderator] So what are the points, in your view, which would lead to the possibility of disarmament?

[Szuros] Arms limitation and disarmament should take place in three stages. In the first stage the USSR and the United States would deal with the number of nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory.

[Moderator] This is the essence of the Soviet proposals submitted prior to the Geneva summit, to which the United States gave an evasive reply. But there is an earlier Soviet proposal which is now incorporated into this more comprehensive proposal.

[Szuros] That is correct. This program which is valid until the year 2000 has several components which the USSR had already formulated and submitted earlier on. These include the Soviet proposal that we should rid Europe of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. So in the first phase the two leading nuclear powers would reduce their nuclear arsenals. In the second phase of reduction other nuclear powers would also participate, and by 1990 at the latest, they would join the negotiations.

I am referring to Britain, France and the PRC. These countries could undertake, if they so wished, to freeze their nuclear arsenals even before that date. Following the 50 percent reduction by the United States and the USSR the five or six nuclear powers could start reducing their long-range weapons. So this is phase two.

[Moderator] Are there any points here where compromise is possible?

[Szuros] Undoubtedly. As we have seen, the package proposal in many respects treats France and Britain separately, as well as the PRC of course. So the great responsibility which is shared by the two leading nuclear powers is expressed here, as Comrade Gorbachev has pointed out. But let me continue. The general and complete elimination of nuclear weapons must be, or should be, achieved in phase 3 between 1995 and 1999. Apart from this the USSR has again suggested that the United States join the unilateral Soviet measure whereby it suspends all nuclear tests. This was announced by the USSR in August last year and was valid until 1 January this year, and the USSR has now extended this moratorium by another 3 months in order to enable the U.S. to join it.

[Moderator] We have a listener who asks how East-West relations are likely to develop if the United States does not abandon its military build-up.

[Szuros] Without a doubt we must also take that prospect into consideration. That is why we are saying that humanity and the world are at a crossroads toward or away from detente. That is the goal of the Soviet proposals, to achieve such a turn. In 1985 we took a step forward.

This year there will be another U.S.-Soviet summit, and we hope that it will facilitate further progress. Before that, however, I would like to say the following to the esteemed listener:

There are certain concrete signs that, in the area of confidence-building measures, in reducing the risk of surprise attacks to a minimum, for instance, we are quite close to an agreement in Stockholm. This, by the way, is also incorporated in the Soviet proposals; namely that the work of these multilateral forums be accelerated. It is also conceivable that progress will be made as early as this year in the area of medium-range missiles. But if the United States insists, for example, on the implementation of the SDI program, the USSR, according to Gorbachev, has all the material and other means at its disposal to give an appropriate reply. This, however, means that mankind will continue to drift along a dangerous path.

[Moderator] My interpretation of your words is that you consider it feasible that progress will be made on certain items in this package, which could influence the negotiations favorably on other matters as well.

[Szuros] That is correct. I think we must show a great deal of patience, circumspection and endurance. This is a question of effort. In connection with one question I have stressed that compromise solutions and agreements are possible on this point. So the USSR has formulated a disarmament program which in one sense deprives the SDI program of its foundation, but the big question is whether it can negate this dangerous, and in many respects illusionary and questionable enterprise, by the United States.

[Moderator] In the past few minutes we have discussed U.S.-Soviet relations and East-West relations. But I think that so-called regional conflicts also have a significant influence on these relations. So what effect do regional crises have on East-West relations and on the international situation?

[Szuros] They have an influence without a doubt both on relations between the USSR and the United States and on the international situation. They damage the atmosphere and there are dangerous hotspots -- whether we are talking about the situation in the Middle East, which is strategically close to the USSR, or the situation in Nicaragua, in the neighborhood of the United States -- where a progressive regime is evolving which is not regarded favorably by the United States. So the possibilities and existence of foreign intervention are certainly damaging the general international atmosphere, and have a concrete effect on relations between the two leading powers and on international processes.

[Moderator] Quite a few questions were raised about the Libyan crisis. They can be summarized as follows: Do you consider it feasible that some sort of a conflict, perhaps armed conflict, can break out between Libya and the United States?

[Szuros] I do not think things are quite as hot as they seem and we are not on the threshold of a world war, not even in the heated situation that has arisen around Libya. It seems that certain circles within the United States would really like to teach Libya a lesson, but in this the United States is not even followed by its allies. Libya was, for many years, in a dependent and exposed situation, both economically and militarily. The country did away with this in the early 1970s. This fact determines its relations with the United States, and in general with certain imperialist and capitalist circles.

I myself regard Libya's policy as progressive. Ultimately its foreign policy is anti-imperialist. For this reason Libya is not viewed very favorably in general, as it pursues quite a colorful and multifaceted policy. But fundamentally this is, as I have mentioned, an anti-imperialist policy.

I would like to talk, however, about the causes which elicited on this occasion the action by the United States against Libya. After all we are talking about centers of tension, their origins, and so forth. So I would like to talk about the question of terrorism, if I can, at this point. After all, in this case terrorism happens to be one of the causes of the situation in which Libya finds itself.

[Moderator] Presumably you are referring to the attacks at the airports of Rome and Vienna. A news agency report claimed that Libya considered these heroic acts. The Libyan leadership, including Al-Qadhdhafi, distanced themselves from this statement. This nevertheless gave a basis on which the United States could attack Libya, alleging that it supports international terrorism.

[Szuros] This is what I was referring to. This is the sort of topic which concerns people very much, and the listeners as well, it seems. This nervousness arose in the wake of the terrorist attacks in Rome and Vienna in December. And the perpetrators were Arabs. Neither the Austrian nor the Italian Governments have confirmed it so far, but reports said that the terrorists belonged to the break-away Palestinian group led by Abu Nidal.

The United States and Israel benefited in the end from these attacks, because they harmed the cause of Arabs and Palestinians, as it again became possible to incite international public opinion against the Arabs, and especially the Palestinians.

[Moderator] We would now like to play back a question which was addressed to you:

[Unidentified caller] The photo of the Arab terrorist who was in charge of the terrorist attack on Vienna has been sent by you to the Austrians. I agree with this; what I do not agree with is that you failed to inform the Hungarian public about it.

[Szuros] I would like to return first to the essence of this question, because the question is how Al-Qadhdhafi is disposed toward this, and how the Palestinians are disposed toward it. The PLO since 1974 has distanced itself from acts of terrorism, and in 1985 and after these attacks the PLO reaffirmed this position.

[Moderator] But perhaps part of the problem is that the PLO meanwhile has broken into two or more factions?

[Szuros] The Palestinian liberation movement is not, unfortunately, united. But there is no doubt that they distanced themselves. It must be known, however, that precisely as a consequence of this rift and as a result of lack of unity, the leadership and the Executive Committee, of this movement, the PLO, is incapable of supervising Palestinian organizations everywhere and always. Moreover, according to the Libyan leader, Al-Qadhdhafi -- who by the way has distanced himself from acts of terrorism -- international terrorism does not exist in isolation, but is a form of expression of certain problems, international problems, for instance. Such a problem is the unsolved nature of the Palestinian cause.

As far as we are concerned, and I would like to raise the matter mentioned by your listener, we reject terrorism, as a phenomenon and method, and we condemn these actions because the victims are innocent people.

They do not achieve their aims, and they should not be the methods used by any revolutionary or independence movement. I think the world is fairly united on this matter. At the same time, terrorism tends to exist in the capitalist world, where certain conditions give rise to it. I do not want to go into detail at this point, but there is no doubt that certain exposed situation and unsolved problems force certain people and groups to adopt such methods.

As far as the affair in Vienna is concerned, it made an especially great impact in our country, because Hungarian citizens were also affected. And naturally, as I have said, we condemn it both on moral and political grounds, but in this case the outrage and alienation which can be detected in the Hungarian People's Republic is understandable for specific reasons.

Well, it is a fact that we have also taken certain measures to exclude the possibility of terrorism. It is also a fact that two of the people who carried out the attack in Vienna arrived in Vienna via Budapest and the territory of the Hungarian People's Republic, by means of forged passports. In other words we have cause to be even more alert and to adopt certain measures. It is not true, however, that these two were in charge of the entire action, as the questioner implied.

[Moderator] Part of this Middle East theme is our relations with Israel. From time to time we hear rumors that Hungary is about to resume diplomatic ties with Israel. What can you tell us? Are these rumors true or false?

[Szuros] Yes, it is true that in the past few months various reports were published mainly in the Western European and Israeli press to the effect that certain socialist countries wanted to establish, or intended to resume, diplomatic links with Israel. The countries most frequently mentioned in these reports are the USSR, Poland, and Hungary.

These tendentious reports have been denied by the leaders of the countries involved, including by us Hungarians. Poland nevertheless has decided, for real humanitarian reasons, to send an envoy to Israel who has the right to issue visas and to accept such an envoy itself. As far as the resumption of diplomatic ties are concerned, however, the Polish position is also unchanged.

The Hungarian position on this matter is already known. Most recently, Comrade Janos Kadar also stated at his press conference in London that there are no obstacles in principle to the resumption of Hungarian-Israeli diplomatic ties, and that the matter could be studied, provided Israel gives evidence of behavior which conforms to the norms of international relations; or more concretely, if the causes which had originally led to the break of diplomatic ties were eliminated.

But if you will allow me, I would like to add something here. While the Israeli position toward the settlement of the Middle East problem hinders the placing on the agenda of the resumption of diplomatic ties, we cannot forget the fact that as a consequence of the policies of Nazi Fascism over 40 years ago now, the Hungarian nation lived through a tragedy. And if I may use the expression, though it might not be an accurate one, the tragedy of Hungarian Jewry which formed an integral part of Hungarian nationhood coincided with this event. Related to this event is the fact that according to some estimates the number of Hungarian-speaking Israeli citizens exceeds 200,000. So we have this sort of interest, so to speak, and attraction as well, and we must take this into account in the shaping of Hungarian-Israeli relations, especially when they concern contacts between peoples, the unification of families, and other issues which have a bearing on this particular situation.

[Moderator] Here is another question from a listener, which is connected with this, though it is insignificant in relation to what you have said. The question, posed by Eszter Mueller, telephone number 200-012, is: When will Hungary have a direct air link with Israel?

[Szuros] Well, at some stage this will probably come about; at the present time to the best of my knowledge it is not on the agenda.

[Szecsi] While we are still on the topic of regional issues, and I think that we could conclude these questions with what now follows, in recent times there have been certain signs that there might be hope in Afghanistan of settling the situation by way of negotiation. Do you see any signs indicating this? How do you see the situation as regards Afghanistan?

[Szuros] Yes, I can see a possibility of the Afghan situation being settled by way of negotiation. Of course, the circumstances which made the continuation of the military actions necessary against the Afghan rebels still exist. In 1985, however, some progress was made as regards the settlement of this affair. Perhaps listeners know that negotiations are under way in Geneva between Afghanistan and Pakistan, with the mediation of the deputy secretary general of the United Nations. This mediation by the deputy secretary general is due to the fact that Pakistan does not yet regard conditions as ripe for conducting direct negotiations with Afghanistan.

[Bolgar] In other words, they do not sit down at the same table to talk to each other. Rather, first one talks to the UN deputy secretary general, then the other.

[Szuros] Yes, that is so. However, by now things have changed to the extent that they are in the same building. What is more, if I am right, in rooms that are close to one another and consequently the deputy secretary general can quickly go from one delegation to the other, and thus these negotiations have speeded up.

What is involved here? Let us be more specific. What do they want to agree on? If I am right, they are preparing for agreements, or at least an agreement consisting of four parts. One of these is aimed at eliminating the possibility of interference in each other's internal affairs. This is a very important matter. The other concerns the possibility of the return of the several million Afghan citizens, that is, inhabitants, who escaped from Afghanistan, to enable them to return freely, as long as they have not committed any crime. Besides this, international guarantees are needed for preventing the entry of the rebels and external interference in the life of Afghanistan. Fourth, the precise conditions and ways and means of solving these three issues will be considered. Finally, they would reach a point where Soviet troops could be withdrawn from Afghanistan and Afghanistan could settle its own affairs entirely by itself.

[Bolgar] And do you see the possibility of achieving all this as being closer today than say 6 months or a year ago?

[Szuros] Yes, I am optimistic in this respect. I also see that besides the interested powers -- the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as Pakistan -- other countries are also making endeavors in this direction. It is very important, however, that correct, clear and guaranteed agreements should be realized.

[Szecsi] We have not yet discussed how the internal political and economic development of individual countries affects the entire international situation. It is enough to think of just the Soviet Union.

It is barely a year since Mikhail Gorbachev was elected general secretary of the CPSU. Since then we have witnessed a considerable livening of political life; there is lively public debate, a great deal of political activity is going on before the party congress and a great many changes have taken place. Before discussing these changes, permit me a somewhat personal question: You were a diplomat in the Soviet Union, an ambassador, you know the present situation and the new leaders. Whom do you know among them and what are your personal relations like, if I may ask such an intimate question?

[Szuros] Well, indeed, I lived in the Soviet Union for 10 years, for 6 years as a university student and for 4 years as ambassador. Besides this, for more than a quarter of a century now I have been dealing both professionally and in my political work with the Soviet Union. Thus, indeed, I have a wide range of personal connections and many acquaintances in the Soviet Union.

I met with General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev on several occasions when I was ambassador to the Soviet Union and, naturally, I know many of the Soviet leaders personally as well. Here, however, the point is that the changes which, as the phrase goes, from a cadre policy of view, are going on in the Soviet Union, are decisive. These are of great importance. There are several new leaders whom I do not know. But this is not what matters here. By now there is less than a month to go before the 27th CPSU Congress which, in my opinion, will be an important milestone. This is where the final body of leaders will develop who will determine the future policy of the Soviet Union.

[Szecsi] The program says that a decisive change must be made in terms of style. I think we are witnessing this in the sphere of economic policy and elsewhere. How do you evaluate this turning point -- what is going on now and what can be expected in the wake of the Congress?

[Szuros] What the Soviet leadership, the CPSU, has in mind appears from the very important documents such as the new draft program, which will be finalized at the 27th CPSU Congress. Since March 1985 one can observe endeavors for renewal and dynamic changes. What I regard as most important is that the CPSU, the Soviet leadership, takes reality as its point of departure. This is indicated also by the fundamental definition regarding the state of development of the Soviet Union. What is involved is the construction of the developed socialist society -- the long, historical process of perfecting it. The Soviet Union is now engaged in this historical phase and, what is more, is essentially at its beginning. Thus, the changes can be perceived only in the long term and the plans and expectations which are currently being formulated will be developed in the long term.

It is very important that they want to achieve a decisive turning point in the move to intensive management and that they want to solve three tasks simultaneously. These are: increasing the performance of the economy; improving living standards; and ensuring national defense. This is a great task. Thus, improving efficiency, accelerating the growth rate and the growth rate of national income, the key issue of technological-scientific progress, and so on, are given an important role in present-day Soviet endeavors. Overall, I repeat, the fundamental goal is to achieve a turning point in the direction of intensive development.

[Bolgar] I think that the changes in style that we have spoken about can be perceived not only in internal but also in foreign policies. I mention this because many listeners have asked questions about Soviet foreign policy. Several have referred to the perceptible greater dynamism of Soviet foreign policy. However, one can note dynamism not only in the sphere of Soviet foreign policy but also economic dynamism and dynamism in public life. How could one summarize the essence of this change of style?

[Szuros] As I have mentioned, the change of style could be summarized first and foremost in the statement that the Soviet Union is taking reality as its point of departure. This is one thing, and an important one because the fundamental starting point of any good policy is that it is based on reality. The other thing is that in the life of the party and in the entire life of the Soviet Union there is a development toward democratism. Increasing the role of the local collectives, as well as increasing the self-governing role of the soviets all show changes in this direction. Besides this, the correct formulation of the role of the party, the simultaneous attention given to the political and professional requirements, the strengthening of discipline and order, the spirit of criticism and self-criticism and in general the people-oriented nature and frankness, professionalism, the realistic and humane handling of existing problems and so on in the sphere of party work, in their totality make up the new style, or it is in these that the new style can be summarized. Perhaps this is not sufficiently clear for listeners, but this is the strengthening once again of the Leninist style of work and the Leninist style in the activities of the CPSU and also in the work of the leaders.

[Szecsi] If it is possible I think we must move on because time is pressing. Several of our listeners ask about China, naturally. I think it is natural and no emphasis is needed considering that extraordinary great and really dynamic transformations are taking place there. We even received a question which links Hungarian foreign policy with the Chinese situation; it enquires about the links between Hungary and China, and what's more, about Hungarian-Chinese interparty relations. How do you assess the Chinese changes?

[Szuros] Large-scale changes are taking place in China. The PRC is in a period of renewal. I would use, with the utmost pleasure, the words of CCP General Secretary Hu Yaobang, because it is he who is most entitled to say what are the fundamental changes taking place in China. If I remember correctly it was he who referred to the fact that the CCP departed from those mistaken ideas of Mao Zedong according to which the class struggle is constantly escalating and growing stronger and, as he said, this would be the cornerstone of the life of the country. Thus, the party, building on the real circumstances of China, set as an aim to increase four-fold production and national income by the turn of the millenium. That is one thing.

The other thing is that the Chinese leadership rejected the so-called Cultural Revolution which took place in the 1966-78 period and gave a correct assessment of both the Cultural Revolution and Mao Zedong. In addition to this the PRC has carried out an opening toward the outside world and has implemented or is implementing an upswing in the economy by gradual though determined reforms in the rural and urban economy.

[Bolgar] This impressed me -- as a non-China expert -- because what I mean is that in China an opening took place in the economy, in internal policy and in foreign policy too. This ultimately laid the foundation for the extraordinarily quick development which was laid down as an objective for the year 2000 but which we experience now already. They even complain that this economic development is too rapid.

[Szuros] Undoubtedly China has achieved impressive results and something else must be added here which needs speaking about, rejuvenation. In other words not only an opening but also a comprehensive renewal is taking place, while at the same time there are doubts and problems in China. Not everything turns out as planned, thus the reforms too must be handled with appropriate caution. Well, what are the outstanding achievements which China has attained? For example, for myself it is particularly interesting that China raised agricultural production to such an extent that it has become a net exporter of cereals.

This is very interesting. In addition there is no doubt that China has taken a big step forward in industrial, so-called urban reforms, in their implementation, in the modernization of industry, living standards have grown, supplies have improved, and clothing has become more fashionable. In other words China has started on its own road, so to speak, keeping in view the realities, and attaining results on this road.

[Bolgar] This can be seen by the world, too, because in recent years anybody has been able to go to China, the country opened up to foreigners. And we, too, may sense the change in that Hungarian-Chinese relations have also improved perceptibly, and so have relations between China and the socialist countries.

[Szuros] Yes, indeed. I can briefly say that the interstate relations between China and the Hungarian People's Republic are settled and this is, therefore, a big step forward in comparison to the previous years. I would also like to say that we have naturally -- at least it may be important that it is not natural from every point of view -- always regarded the PRC as a socialist country. Thus our interstate relations are settled, top-level contacts and meetings have taken place. For example this year we are expecting a foreign ministerial meeting, and PRC Vice Premier Li Peng has already visited here, while in the spring a Hungarian parliamentary delegation will probably visit China. Trade turnover has been continuously increasing since 1984, and in 1985 the value of turnover reached 760 million Swiss francs which means the turnover has trebled within a few years. We have signed a framework agreement for 1986-90 regarding the dvelopment of trade. Therefore, there are further prospects. Naturally, there are further possibilities primarily in the spheres of developing economic relations and cooperation.

[Bolgar] Here we have moved on to relations between Hungary and foreign countries, on to Hungarian foreign policy, but I think that before we move on to these questions in detail, let us listen to a bit of music. Let me just call the listeners' attention to the fact that you are listening to "Radio Diary," our guest is Matyas Szuros, secretary of the Central Committee, and you may telephone us on 130099 or 139024.

[Moderator] We have already spoken about the main trends in world politics and the internal affairs of the countries close to us. It logically follows that we should now speak about Hungarian foreign policy, of Hungary's relations with its allies, neighbors, capitalist partners. I think that for us the quality of our relationship with the Soviet Union is of decisive importance. We had an interesting question from a listener in this connection. Let us listen to it.

[Unidentified caller] I am speaking from Tatabanya 14-214. Last week there was an article on Hungary in Moscow PRAVDA. In this article, besides many realistic and useful evaluations, there were some criticisms as well of Hungary. What I would like to ask you is: What do you think of the criticism and of the issues that were the subject of the criticism?

[Szuros] Yes, this particular article was published in PRAVDA. If I remember well, the title of the article was "Areas of Cooperation." The listener presumably put his questions without being familiar with the whole of the text. The article in fact provides a comprehensive picture, what is more, one based on the statements by Hungarian leaders and economic specialists, as well as on the personal experiences of the authors, of developments in Hungary, and first and foremost of our economic development. However, the article deals with other matters as well. It praises the economic and social conditions in Hungary, our progress, as well as various particular Hungarian solutions.

At the same time it refers, among other things, to the possibility that the development of economic relations between Hungary and the capitalist countries could raise certain problems, for example, the question of excessive dependence, if we were to approach this in a one-sided manner. It refers also to the problems concerning the undesirable ideological influences which arise with the wide-ranging relations, not only economic relations but also tourism, relations between the populations and so on.

[Bolgar] But while the article says these things it also notes that there is an awareness of these matters in Hungary.

[Szuros] Yes, that is so. The article, as I have mentioned, refers to our leaders, who at some stage received the two authors for a background conversation in this connection. One of them, incidentally is Gerasimov, who is the PRAVDA's Budapest correspondent and the other is a colleague of his, who came especially from Moscow to become acquainted with the situation.

Overall, the article emphasizes that the Hungarian leadership is aware of these problems and is taking them into consideration when developing its policy and its practical activities. Just one more thing, and I hope that I believe this correctly. Precisely because this PRAVDA article has evoked such a great response, on the basis of the excerpts which were published in NEPSZABADSAG, there is a plan that perhaps the weekly MAGYARORSZAG, will publish the text of this article. I think that in this case the dear listener will also be able to study it more thoroughly and then he will realize that this article is not as critical as he assumed in his question.

[Szecsi] Several listeners have asked about Hungarian-Soviet economic relations. As has been said, there is a new outlook in the Soviet Union, conditions are more rigorous. Will the requirements be more rigorous also as far as we are concerned?

[Szuros] Hungarian-Soviet economic relations are developing in a spirit of mutual aid and, naturally, within the framework of mutual advantages. If we consider that which we have already spoken about, namely that the Soviet Union is advancing toward modernity and intensive development, then it is natural that the requirements will grow also as regards external partners. Thus, they will grow in relation to Hungary as well. The Soviet Union expects increasingly better, more developed, more modern products within the framework of Hungarian-Soviet trade. In this sense, therefore, the requirements will be greater. This is not a question of some sort of political decision but is a natural concomitant of the development of economic relations. Thus, we must pay closer attention, get to know the Soviet market better, and must fulfill the expectations because it is in this way that our economic cooperation can further develop and expand.

It is essential for Hungary that this cooperation develop. The Soviet Union's participation in Hungary's foreign trade amounts to more than 30 percent. In other words, more than one-third, or about one-third, of our total trade is with the Soviet Union.

[Bolgar] And the Soviet Union is delivering us essential goods, such as energy and basic raw materials. However, there is a question in this connection which is rather often raised these days: Is it worth our while to invest in the Soviet Union? Let us take, for example, natural gas from Yamburg. In a few years we shall receive an extra quantity of natural gas from Yamburg -- I believe 2 billion cubic meters per year on top of the quantity delivered at present. This is about half of the present level of deliveries. Thus, we would receive 50 percent more natural gas from the Soviet Union. On the other hand, we must participate in the investments there. Is this worthwhile for us?

[Szuros] Yes, it is. I would like to say, in connection with the previous question, that the Soviet Union is an extremely important, number one, economic partner for us. I would like to say how decisive this is for the development of the Hungarian economy. The Soviet Union is our biggest partner, while the Hungarian People's Republic is in fourth or fifth place in international economic relations with the Soviet Union. These proportions will remain during the next 5 years, and during the Seventh 5-Year Plan period, as well. It is very important as regards ensuring the continuous imports of energy, raw materials and basic materials to keep it at the necessary level, and for this we must also expand our possibilities of delivering to the Soviet Union.

Now, to return to the concrete question, the question of the Yamburg gas pipeline, and the economic advantages for Hungary in participating in it, what I would like to say is that this is extremely important, particularly from the aspect of our long-term supply of energy. After all, Hungary will receive 2 billion cubic meters of natural gas from the Soviet Union up to the year 2008.

[Bolgar] In other words, we shall get this over a period of 20 years?

[Szuros] Yes, that is so. This is something that we shall largely pay for with Hungarian products, for example with construction machinery, consumer goods, as well as participation in the work where it is carried out -- not in the construction of the gas pipeline but elsewhere. In the long term, taking all the possibilities into consideration, this appears to be obviously economically beneficial to Hungary, mainly because of the long-term certainty.

[Szecsi] Here is a statement, in reference to earlier questions, that people agree with Hungarian foreign policy, only not everybody understands everything -- I think that is obvious -- and that not everybody agrees all the time with what we do on particular occasions. For example, concerning the Bos-Nagymaros water barrage, we received a very interesting question regarding this issue.

[Caller] I am Janos Banfalvi of Zalagerszeg, my telephone number is 12858. My question concerns the Bos-Nagymaros water barrage system. I hear that it is being criticized, that it destroys the environment, that it is not beneficial, and so on. What is the reason for this criticism?

[Szuros] We agreed with our Czechoslovak friends in 1977 to build the Bos-Nagymaros water barrage system and hydro-power station and it is a natural thing -- it was discussed last year, too, in the Radio Diary program, by the way. Environmental protection measures and issues were raised differently from the way they are raised today. Therefore it is well known -- and if it is not, then I repeat -- that Hungarian scientists, hand-in-hand with Czechoslovak scientists and, by the way, Soviet scientists, have prepared a comprehensive study about the harm which may result from this large construction project regarding the environment.

[Szecsi] Because it may come about...

[Szuros interrupts] Indeed. Therefore this construction is going to cost more than originally planned because we would have to create environmental protection measures and establishments and take extra measures indeed in order to eliminate these problems.

I would like to emphasize one thing in this connection -- it has already been decided that we will build the Bos-Nagymaros water barrage system and the power station in such a way that the Hungarian scenery, the Hungarian territory and in general the Danube region on Czechoslovak territory too should not be harmed as a result. I would like to add that, of course, there are people in Hungary -- indeed, if I am right, they are called "Blues" -- who even today are worried aobut what is going to happen, whether we would not deface that beautiful historical scenery, for example the Danube bend and so on. I trust Hungarian scientists, and I think that they have carried out this great work responsibly so that the Hungarian Government can take measures with this knowledge.

Second, no one should assume that we Hungarian leaders, members of the government, like our homeland less than those who are now worrying. Therefore, I myself, personally, subjectively, understand if somebody is anxious about his homeland, about the environment. It would be incorrect, however to take a position as though the government or the leadership of the Hungarian People's Republic would forget about this. So this is how I think this issue is going to develop. It will ultimately be built and we will do everything possible so that no harm will be done to the country and in the end it must be built in such a way that it will bring economic advantages, for example, from the point of view of Danube shipping, flood protection. Also the fact cannot be ignored that it will produce electrical energy. These in their totality are economical.

[Moderator] We have many questions regarding Hungarian-Romanian relations. Here is one of them:

[Unidentified caller] What is the opinion of Comrade Szuros regarding the situation of the Hungarian nationality in Romania?

[Szuros] This is a question that crops up quite often, together with the question of Hungarian-Romanian relations.

[Moderator] Excuse me for interrupting, but the listeners are also asking what Hungarian foreign policy is doing? And we have another listener asking if we can expect a Hungarian-Romanian summit meeting sometime in the future?

[Szuros] This is quite a number of questions on one topic. Regarding Hungarian-Romanian relations, I would like to say that we would like to have better relations. This topic cropped up last year as well, in the Radio Diary program. And last year Hungarian state and social organs took initiatives with great responsibility for the implementation of the program adopted at the summit meetings in Debrecen and Oradea in 1977. The questions were related to this matter as well.

It is our conviction that the program developed with great care is a realistic one, it deals comprehensively with Hungarian-Romanian relations in their entirety. I have neither the time nor the opportunity to go into details, but the program contains tasks which are valid for a long time. These tasks are timely today as well, and their realization would serve equally the cause fo the Hungarian and Romanian peoples.

In Hungarian-Romanian relations, however, there has not been a favorable change, unfortunately. It has to be stated that in several areas possibilites for cooperation have become more restricted. In other words, there are obstacles in the way of solutions which were developed and approved together. Our opinion is that the problems and tasks which exist in bilateral relations must be solved with a great deal of patience, goodwill and understanding by the two sides concerned. There can be no questions of internationalizing the difficulties and problems that exist in this area.

It is incorrect to voice historical rights and to call to account grievances of the past today. And to sum it all up, I would like to refer to a phenomenon, somewhat indirectly, which can be seen today. It is not right to raise certain tarnished periods of our common history, or some of its sensitive aspects, to the level of official propaganda or simply propaganda.

[Moderator] Are you referring to the various articles published?

[Szuros] Yes, it sometimes happens that certain historical issues are tackled at this level. It is better if these are discussed by academics, because we really must be familiar with history, and aspects of history must be admitted, but I think that this is really the task of historians. So we are displaying a great deal of patience and circumspection. Our platform continues to be the program adopted in Debrecen and Oradea in 1977.

And now I would like to say a few words about the nationalities question. A fundamental characteristic of our nationalities policy is that in the assertion of rights we should strive for demands that are wider than those being manifesting in real life. So I would like to say that our policy is that the majority must show courtesy or as Gyula Illyes [Hungarian writer] once said, a great deal of tact toward the minority.

The settlement of the issue of the Hungarian nationality, by the way, is the domestic affair of Romania, but of course there are also international aspects. But what we strive for is that the nationalities should not create problems in the development of relations between our countries or in their cultivation, but play the role of a link, a bridge.

So this is our view on this matter, and we believe that this is the path to follow.

[Moderator] Unfortunately time is running out. Just briefly: What do you expect from this year. Do we have concrete plans in Hungarian foreign policy?

[Szuros] I expect a great deal from this year. I expect that this detente which began to strengthen in 1985 will strengthen and develop further. As regards Hungary's foreign policy all I can say is that we shall continue with our present foreign policy activities and directions, as confirmed by the 13th Party Congress. I can state, without being immodest, that events have proved it correct. It has its own priorities and basic principles, and so on, and we shall pursue them.

It is of great significance that the Political Consultative body of the Warsaw Pact, where we coordinate our international activities, will be holding its session in Hungary this year.

OPERATION 'RED FLAG' REMINISCENT OF REAL WAR'

LD301433 Warsaw Domestic Serivce in Polish 1105 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Zdislaw Stankiewicz commentary]

[Text] The very fact of holding the U.S.-Army maneuvers is nothing out of the ordinary. Every army in every state trains its soldiers and tests their capabilities in conditions approximating those in battle. The opposing side is usually called the Whites or the Greens; (?they) are also denoted by other colors. This time, it's different. The color is only mentioned in the codename for the maneuvers. It is called: Operation Red Flag.

A Pentagon representative, Colonel John (Maden) has stated in the press -- and I quote -- that these exercises are the most serious military maneuvers by the United States Armed Forces up to now. A scenario reminiscent of a real war is being played out. I say again: nothing out of the ordinary either. Every large set of maneuvers are of this nature. Operation Red Flag is differentiated, however, by a very important detail. The supposed opponents with whom the American Army is waging a furious struggle on United States territory are wearing Soviet Army uniforms; and the mock bombs falling on American towns are dropped from planes marked with Soviet Air Force emblems.

This has never happened before, in any army, in any state. But it has happened now, in January 1986, a mere 3 months after the Soviet-American summit in Geneva; after numerous statements by the American President about the desire to strengthen world peace. The manifest anti-Soviet, provocative character of Operation Red Flag calls in doubt the sincerity of those intentions. And the fact that the operation is being carried out proves that the spirit of Geneva has no access to the Pentagon at all.

ORZECHOWSKI MAKES FOREIGN POLICY REPORT TO SEJM

LD291834 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1600 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Speech by Foreign Minister Orzechowski at 19 January session of Polish Sejm in Warsaw -- recorded]

[Text] Citizen Speaker, may it please the house. On 12 November last year, Professor Zbigniew Messner, chairman of the Council of Ministers, defined in the government program the main directions and objectives of Polish foreign policy. Today, on behalf of the government, I would like to present to the house a more comprehensive report on the international situation, and the tasks of foreign policy this year.

Our foreign policy principles have remained unchanged from the very beginning of People's Poland. In essence, these are: fraternal alliance and universal cooperation with the Soviet Union and with all socialist states, friendly cooperation with developing states and solidarity with the forces of progress in the world, peaceful coexistence with states with a different systems than ours, and the will to maintain with them good, equal, and mutually beneficial relations.

Foreign policy based on the these principles must successfully ensure Poland's security, the inviolability of its borders and its territorial integrity, peaceful existence, favorable external conditions for the development of the socialist fatherland, and the fulfillment of the national aspirations of the Polish people.

1985 was an important stage in Poland's return to the international arena, its inclusion in the dialogue on peace and security in Europe and in the world.

The voice of Poland on issues concerning Europe and the world, the voice of the country of over 37 million people, with undeniable moral authority, rich with great intellectual potential, raw material and energy resources, social achievements, traditions of national culture, is equal to the challenge of present day reality. It took part in preparing the way for the trend toward peace and peaceful co-existence between nations and states.

We have strengthened our position in the socialist community; we have stabilized our partnership economic relations; we have deepened and qualitatively enriched our political links with the Soviet Union and the other socialist states; we have successfully implmented our plans for economic, scientific, and technical cooperation. Our contribution has been considerable in the development and consolidation of socialist integration within the CEMA framework.

We have managed to overcome many barriers of isolation in the capitalist world. This was achieved by our success in removing the results of the crisis, by the growing social trust in the party's policy -- particularly expressed by the results of the last year's elections to the Sejm -- and also the realization of the futility of anti-Polish endeavors and the growth of political realism in the West.

Our political relations with many Western states, including Greece, Italy, Austria, and Finland, have been developing favorably. We have activated relations with Japan by developing political dialogue and trade exchange. We have noted progress in economic relations with the West which was expressed by agreements with the Paris Club, among others, for rescheduling Polands's payments in 1982-84 and 1985. But progress and the level of normalization of relations with the West are still not complete. The fabric of our political and economic relations with many capitalist countries is still fragile and unstable.

We have broadened contacts with developing states. The visit by Wojciech Jaruzelski to India created a new quality in the traditionally close cooperation with India. Measurable results have been obtained from the visit to Libya, Algeria, and Tunisia. We have gained new friends and partners; we have consolidated economic, scientific, and cultural bonds. At the same time, we have become aware of colossal, still untapped possibilities in this sphere, and an inability to make fuller use of our chances and opportunities.

Last year's achievements can be described in one phrase: Poland has effectively destroyed the barriers set up to isolate it from a part of Europe and the world. Regaining its rightful place, Poland has given proof that it can be relied upon in Europe and the world as a strong and stable country, and that without such a Poland there will be no equal and lasting security and detente in Europe. Last year also confirmed other truths: about the importance of the alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union, about Poland relying on the strength and unity of the states of the socialist community, and about direct links between the internal situation of the country, its economic strength, and the progress of national accord, with its international position and role. A categorical political and moral imperative arises from this: Whoever wants a truly great and strong Poland, a Poland respected in Europe and the world, is obliged to cooperate in the internal integration of the homeland and in multiplying its material and spiritual wealth.

May it please the house! We live in difficult and dangerous times. The world and Europe are entering a new period, which cannot easily be assessed unequivocally. We notice positive trends in the contemporary world. We also clearly see all the threats. We approach the former realistically and with hope; the latter we do not magnify but we do not intend to minimalize them either.

A call for the safe existence of nations, for cooperation and peace was again heard from the Soviet Union, as so many times before. The proposal to free the world from nuclear weapons before the end of the century, presented by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January this year, is a particularly significant and consistent sign of the Soviet Union's Leninist and peaceful policy. It is a policy of realism and good will, and a many-sided and constructive approach to the most complex issues of the present world. It presents an alternative to the course of confrontation and tension. It is gaining the support of the European and world public opinion, which listens to the voice of the Soviet Union with growing attention. Peace is the only chance for mankind's survival and for its development in a divided world. Its preservation and consolidation calls for not only hope but also courage and determination in actions from all people, and first and above all, from governments and politicans. The Soviet initiative makes us realize with full strength the elementary truth of our times: We are destined either to coexist or to die, in the ideologically divided world. A nuclear war, including one which spreads into space, cannot be won.

War, therefore, has become absurd. History teaches, however, that human activity has often reached criminal absurdities, where conflict was not avoided. This truth points to the main aims and directions of our foreign policy. At the center of its aims is man's highest value -- peace and security.

The Soviet initiative expresses our own hopes and strivings, our national interest in its deepest substance. We see in it the mutual program and aim of the socialist community's aspirations. It synthesises all the considerations resulting from disarmament negotiations so far, including those in which Poland took and is taking part. We will support it, joining in with our own thoughts and initiatives. We are, however, realists. We have no illusions. A speedy return to detente is not possible. The tension in East-West relations which has taken over nearly all spheres of international life, will not easily recede. We approve with satisfaction the positive echoes of Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal in West Europe and the United States. But we are monitoring even more attentively every, even the smallest, step in the direction of detente. We trust only deeds. We state with disillusionment and anxiety that declarations are frequently accompanied by completely contrary actions, and words often serve to mask intentions.

Liquidation of the present armed structure of international tension demands strenuous activity. In the United States, forces which stand for confrontation, for escalation of the arms race, for an increase in tension, continue to be influential. They aim to block the dialogue begun in Geneva; they want to disturb the development of socialist states by imposing upon them an intensified defensive effort. The leading place in this particular trend is held by the program of building space strike weapons. The hopes of conservative political circles in the United States, the military-industrial complex, and certain scientific circles engaged in research on the new weapons systems are linked to the fulfillment of this program. Insistence on the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative leads to calculably dangerous consequences in the strategic situation. The United States' European allies, above, all, should keep their attention on this, especially those who have declared their acceptance of the SDI program. Their calculations on the achievement of aims tied to it are, however, hopeless. The Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact did not allow for the infringement by imperialism of the balance of forces in the past; equally, it will not allow this in the present.

May it please the house! The seriousness of the international situation means that the main aim of our foreign policy, which is the defense of peace, supporting and paving the way for initiatives and actions serving disarmament and security, will be realized in the tension between two opposing tendencies, that of detente and that of confrontation.

The victory of the trend toward detente is not preordained. Poland's realistic, forward-looking foreign policy must take into account different situations and be prepared for them. The development of events indicates that the first symptoms of a warming-up of the international climate and of detente do not automatically lead to a change in the West's attitude to Poland, to an end to the policy of isolation, restrictions, and discrimination. We have no right to exclude the possibility -- because much points to it -- that the United States will maintain a policy hostile to Poland, gaining the support of some NATO allies for it by means of various pressures.

However, awareness of the difficulties piling up on our road must not and will not be a factor weakening the determination of our action. On the contrary: it should be an incentive toward courageous actions, toward taking advantage of all our chances and possibilities. We are profoundly convinced that one cannot give effective support to the Soviet Union's peace initiatives without multiplying the strength and consolidating the political and defensive alliance of the states of the socialist community of the Warsaw Pact.

Our attitude to the socialist community is defined by the conviction -- confirmed by experience -- that everything which enriches it and increases its strength also strengthens Poland and serves its national interest, creating additional possibilities for us to carry on an active and independent international policy. And vice versa: everything that harms our allies and friends also harms us, Poland, and its interests. Our initiatives linked with the implementation of the decisions contained in the Sofia Declaration of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee on removing the nuclear threat, on a turn toward a better situation for Europe and for the whole world, and with the decisions approved at the meeting of Warsaw Pact party and state leaders in Prague last November, are born out of a sense of joint responsibility for the unity and strength of the community. We give particular importance to scientific and technical cooperation and the implementation of the comprehensive program of scientific-technical progress of the CEMA states up to the year 2000. In the conditions of the technological war which some Western countries are waging against the socialist states, our close and coordinated cooperation is absolutely essential. It is a demand of the Polish raison d'etat.

May it please the house! The cornerstone of our foreign policy was, is, and will be friendship and all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union. We want to develop and enrich it, serving the mutual rapprochement of our peoples and a more effective implementation of our common goals.

Feeling responsible for the fate of our nations and states, we will nurture and deepen bilateral relations with the fraternal socialist countries, particularly with our immediate neighbors the CSSR and the GDR. It is our aim and our will to provide these relations with new substance, to harness in the implementation of cooperation programs new social circles, institutions, and enterprises. We wish to strengthen and to develop the structures and mechanisms of interhuman contacts, tourist exchange, cooperation between social circles, in order to provide a lively and richer substance to the idea of socialist community.

The stability of socioeconomic relations in Poland, the progress in national accord, and the social reforms create favorable conditions toward that goal. Seeing the world of socialism in all its variety and complexity we attach great importance to relations with the PRC. Guided by the good and the interest of the entire community we will develop mutually beneficial economic, cultural, and scientific cooperation -- which still hides colossal untapped potential -- and we will raise political dialogue to a higher level. We hope that it will serve well the common cause of peace, disarmament, security, social progress, and socialism and that it will consolidate all that unites us and remove and overcome what divides us. We will also strive to develop friendly relations with the People's Socialist Republic of Albania.

Citizen deputies, Poland, an inseparable part of Europe, feels jointly responsible for its civilization heritage and cultural identity, and for its peaceful future. We have provided much testimony to prove it. We do not limit them to general statements like those who constantly use the words Europe, Europeans, European community, responsibility for Europe. These are great words, but we have been bringing reality back to the activities of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to scientific, technical, and economic cooperation, to everything that can counteract the deepening division of Europe. We confirmed our basic stance again at the session of the Warsaw Pact Advisory Political Committee in Sofia. Peace in our continent can only be achieved by way of detente, disarmament, increased trust, and development of international cooperation.

Europe is the common home of all the people living here; it depends on them whether there will be links making possible mutual contacts which will create the conditions for fruitful cooperation.

The Yalta and Potsdam order shaped as the result of the victory over the German Reich and the postwar development of Europe is one of the foundations of peace in Europe. To recognize and respect it is an indispensable condition for the building of detente and peaceful cooperation in Europe. Poland's activity within the CSCE process is an expression of our attitude to European issues. This includes participation in all work involved in it. We see in the CSCE process a joint instrument which serves and should serve the consolidation of security and cooperation in Europe. It is a valuable and indispensable factor of the European reality. We note with satisfaction that like ourselves, many other states see the need for a return to the spirit and letter of the Helsinki Final Act in mutual relations. The Stockholm conference on means of building trust, security, and disarmament in Europe is an extremely signficiant part of the process. We are pleased with the impetus it received from the Soviet-American summit in Geneva. Speeding up its work would allow successful completion of its first stage before the Vienna autumn meeting of representatives of the CSCE states.

As we did last year, we shall make efforts to achieve concrete results as soon as possible, in the Vienna negotiations on mutual reduction of military forces and arms in central Europe. The idea of creating on the European Continent a lasting structure of relations that would form the basis for the policy of detente exists within the sphere of interests of our foreign policy invariably and traditionally.

Let us recall that the proposal of 1957 to create a nuclear-free zone in central Europe known as the Rapacki Plan, as well as the idea of freezing armaments in this region put forward by Wladyslaw Gomulka in 1963 acted as forerunners of disarmament talks on a regional scale. The idea of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world is still alive. We support proposals to create such zones in the Balkans and in Northern Europe. We support the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in central Europe on both sides of the line dividing the NATO and Warsaw Pact states.

May it please the house! Poland is particularly interested in creating just this kind of Europe by the Geneva climate that is being born. It is in the interest of the whole world. Acting on behalf of our national rights and interests, we shall use the climate of detente, all hopes arising from it and the realism growing in Western Europe. The basic aim of Polish foreign policy which involves all our efforts is to completely overcome Poland's isolation, neutralize constant attempts to restore it and abolish restrictions. They harm Poland and those who use them. They spoil the peaceful coexistence of the European nations, putting the achievements of Helsinki and Geneva under a question mark.

We want to strengthen and extend the substance of bilateral political, economic, and cultural relations with many countries in Europe.

There is one socialist Poland. Her interests and strivings are represented by the constitutional authorities of the Polish People's Republic. This is the only realistic and fruitful plane of cooperation with Poland, on the basis of the universally recognized principles of international law; and above all, of sovereign equality and noninterference. All attempts to interfere in our internal affairs: at treating Poland as an instrument, at imposing on her a scenario of relations and official contacts, are doomed to fiasco. They must not and will not be ways to the normalization of relations with our country. The authorities say this but the people does not think otherwise, valuing its own dignity, national pride and independence to take sovereign decisions on its own matters above everything.

May it please the house! A subject of our particular concern is economic relations with the Western countries. We know what the state of our economy is; what a burden the debts are for it. We know the scale of the difficulties that await us. The restrictions and obstacles, multiplied by some Western partners, are supposed to incline us towards political concessions, to silent consent to interference in our internal affairs. This is unacceptable to us; it was in the most difficult times for us and it never will be acceptable. An essential condition for mutually beneficial economic cooperation is the cessation of limitations in economic relations, dictated by political reasons; conditions of equality in law for our exports to Western markets; the removal of barriers to the importation of technology; the rebuilding of normal financial and credit relations with the Western countries and international organizations. One of the most important roads leading to a consolidation of the spirit of Geneva is the construction of an infrastructure of detente and peaceful cooperation, of economic cooperation with Western Europe. We think this could be well served by an about-face in relations between the EEC and CEMA.

Our experience in economic relations with the West has caused us to note with all the greater attention and to fully support the important initiative by the Soviet Union on international economic security. It is an inseparable part of the security of every nation and state and also of international security in the global sense.

We can only build them in an atmosphere of mutual trust. This aim is also served by Poland's initiative for the building of trust in international economic relations. Poland is conducting detailed talks on the matter of debts. The talks are difficult. The partners often lack realism in their approach to our needs, connected to the fulfillment of our obligations. It is not a question of philanthropy. We do not expect it. We do not beg from anyone, and we do not intend to do so. We made an enormous effort to meet our obligations. This requires, however, cooperation with us, and not the multiplication of difficulties.

Poland does not hide its problems and economic difficulties resulting from the burden and consequences of debts. Anyway, who after all does not have them in the contemporary world? Triumphing over them depends to a large extent on the restoration of normal principles of financial and credit cooperation with the leading creditor states in the West. We are grateful to everyone who, in the workings of the Paris Club, showed understanding for our problems. We wish that our leading creditors will comprehensively analyze our position and will show greater realism.

We understand however, and we stress with full force, that not only rescheduling, not only restructuring, but above all honest work by all Poles, better organization of work, a more effective system of incentives, greater national economic effectiveness, an increase in export and its potential will make possible the servicing of the debt, and in perspective, its reduction by degrees.

May it please the house! The state of the contemporary world, our specific experiences and interests within it, decide relations between Poland and the United States, France, and the FRG. Unfortunately, we state with regret that the present pattern of relations with the United States does not indicate its readiness to change its policy regarding Poland. Despite our frequent expressions of interest in improving relations with a great country and nation, to which we are linked by traditionally good relations based on the principles of respect for sovereignty and nonintervention in internal affairs, the United States continues an unfriendly policy toward Poland. This is demonstrated in the maintenance of illegal economic restrictions, in propaganda aggression, in giving active support to antisocialist forces. The U.S. Administration continues to treat Poland in an instrumental manner. It exploits our difficulties to maintain a state of uncertainty and mistrust in the country, to disturb the process of national agreement, political stabilization, and economic development.

It is also openly striving to exclude us from the process of detente between East and West. In the past few months alone, we have had many proofs of this. We will be informing public opinion about all the steps hostile to Poland by the U.S. authorities; about restrictions and discrimination; about attempts to blackmail and terrorize. The world must know what in fact is concealed behind the declarations on traditional feelings of friendship toward the Polish people, on understanding for its aspirations, needs, and strivings.

Continuing and sometimes stepping up the anti-Polish policy, U.S. representatives generally cite democracy and freedom, which is allegedly lacking in Poland; they cite human rights, allegedly violated in Poland by its authorities. Others may have, but the United States has no moral right to teach us and the other socialist states about democracy, freedom, humanism. There is a great sense of superiority over smaller nations, but the reality of so-called American democracy in matters connected with freedom and human rights only underlines the hypocrisy of those who refer to it. The contemporary American reality is far from the idealized picture outlined halfway through the 19th century by Alexis de Tocqueville, the French lawyer and politician. At that time, he saw this democracy as a pattern for Europe. Those times have long since passed.

We Poles do not teach anybody but we will not allow anybody to make reprimands which are an affront to our dignity. We have nothing to be ashamed of in democracy, freedom, humanism, human rights. Social security, freedom from the threat of unemployment, respect for the individual and for human dignity, mass access to culture, equal opportunities, development of various forms of self-management and joint decisionmaking on public affairs: these speak for themselves.

Our stance on relations with the United States is clear and unchanging. Their normalization is possible. It is in the interest of both peoples and states, of Europe and of the world. Our proposal for intergovernmental talks to examine matters between ourselves and the United States in their entirety, and their prospects, still stands. We will not overlook even the slightest sign of good will, but neither will we fail to respond to every gesture and step hostile to us.

May it please the house! Last year we gave proof that we should, and wanted to, break out of the enchanted circle in which Polish-French relations have been stuck for years. This would be in accordance with tradition; with the logic of the development of the international situation; with the interests of our peoples; and with their striving for peace and security in Europe. It is not our intention that France's traditional place in Poland, shaped and consolidated through the decades, should be taken by somebody else.

We need each other mutually. Poland needs France, France needs Poland. We do not want the 1975 charter of principles of friendship, of friendly cooperation between the Polish People's Republic and the French Republic to become merely a historic document, belonging to the past. The proof of our attitude to France, and Polish-French ties, was the December meeting between Wojciech Jaruzelski and Francois Mitterrand. From the perspective of almost 2 months, one can see that it had significant dimensions. It was an act of courage by both sides, from a feeling of responsibility for the fate and future of both nations and states. It opens the way for a return to dialogue and cooperation, and is in the long-term interests of both states. It resounded with a loud echo in the world. It introduced a weighty contribution to the East-West dialogue. We do not want it to be merely an episode, an important, interesting episode but without deeper consequences for the entirety of Polish-French relations. The tradition of many centuries of Polish-French ties obliges us to restore their former shape and extent. Poland is aware of their general European dimensions. Everything which takes place between Poland and France has a significant meaning for the whole of Europe, for the creation of an appropriate climate for agreement and cooperation, for the halting of the division of Europe.

Much catching up is to be done in Polish-French relations. This can be done with the goodwill of both sides, with the convergence of intentions, through courageous and farsighted behavior. We approve with satisfaction the declaration that it is France's desire to restore its former place in Poland. We believe that it will take measurable shape in economic relations, in the understanding of our proposals in this sphere, in political dialogue, in the intensification of cooperation in other areas.

Citizen deputies, we confirm our will and our readiness to continue and to develop comprehensive relations with the FRG, to enrich the progress which we have achieved in the previous 15 years. We are fully aware of the position and role of the FRG as an economic partner of Poland. We also appreciate the perceptiveness of FRG society regarding the achievements and the value of Poland's culture and art. These are objective phenomena and processes. We are watching them attentively. We are drawing conclusions from them. We are supporting and stimulating everything which aids real agreement between our states and nations, through triumphing over the past, through shaping a proper and therefore real impae of Poland and the Poles, which creates the substance of relations between Poland and the FRG, in accordance with our national rights and interests.

The past decades show clearly that our attitude to the FRG is not defined and has never been defined by either irrational hostility or by equally irrational resentment. Without forgetting the past and the conclusions drawn from it, we look first and foremost to the future.

One cannot, however, create a whole future without looking into the past; without removing everything that infects the present. We include in this the attempts, which still occur, to question the essence of the treaty of 7 December 1970; the official support for the strivings of revisionists (?in) their enlarged substance; the unrealistic demands made of us, which are unacceptable as a plane for mutual relations and dialogue. The FRG Government must be convinced that in the future too all signs of revisionism, obstinate refusal -- giving rise to the natural opposition not only of Poles -- to recognize the irrevocable results of World War II, will meet with unequivocal and firm reaction from the Polish side, its people, and its government. On this issue, let no one count on our tractability.

Our critical attitude toward Bonn was, is, and will be in future exclusively a response to trends and phenomena in the policy of the FRG which conflict with the 1970 treaty and which are worrying to us. Relations between Poland and the FRG cannot be treated in isolation from the broader, European context. The 1970 treaty was one of the legal-political pillars of the process of detente. Just as without that treaty there would certainly be no Helsinki Act, so too now without filling the treaty with a live and constructive content there can be no real development and true deepening of the (?processes) of the CSCE.

The recently celebrated 15th anniversary of the treaty was an opportunity to draw up a balance of Polish-FRG relations and to draw the conclusions which should be a starting-point for the second phase of the normalization process. It cannot be based on declarations alone. Words have weight when they are accompanied by deeds. The basic criterion for evaluating the FRG's attitude to Poland is and will be the attitude of the FRG to the Yalta-Potsdam peaceful territorial-political order in Europe. Its supporting beam is the border on the Odra and the Nysa Luzycka. Life has proved that an essential condition for both sides for progress in mutual relations is lasting respect by the FRG for those elementary rights which contain the substance of the Polish raison d'etat.

The most vital interests of the Polish people and state -- this is why we note with satisfaction everything that shows that realism and a refusal of fiction-like German legal positions are making headway in the FRG, and which define the attitude toward Poland by political and social forces.

Not forgetting the experiences of the past, and looking ahead to the future, we are ready to begin a new chapter in relations with FRG. This readiness includes all spheres of the life of our states and peoples and it will assume a realistic form only when it meets with satisfactory reaction from Bonn on issues of particular interest to us.

May it please the house! We are interested in the development of relations and political dialogue with Great Britain. We are also interested in the mutually beneficial development of relations with Japan, particularly in the field of international contacts, in the field of economics, and financial and credit cooperation. We would like to enlarge political dialogue with that state.

We are still interested in progress in the normalization of mutual relations with the Vatican and we uphold the stance expressed in the Sejm in recent years on behalf of the PPR Government. We respect the involvement of the Holy See in the cause of peace, international dialogue, and in the building of trust in relations between states. We note with attention the voice of Pope John Paul II who has expressed concern for the future of the world, and who has warned mankind against the results of armaments.

A strong expression of this concern was seen in the words addressed on his behalf to the Warsaw Congress of Intellectuals. We believe that cooperation with the Holy See in the consolidation of international peace and detente is not only realistic, but also very much desired.

May it please the house! In our external relations we would like to place cooperation with the developing countries on a higher level. The developing countries are very dissimilar; they have different interests, possibilities, and attitudes toward Poland ranging from indifference to real friendliness linked with a wish to establish economic and cultural cooperation. In relations with those states we are guided by the proven principle that those who are absent are wrong. We would like, wherever possible, to make effective use of any chance for economic and cultural cooperation, and to support the developing countries politically and morally. We think their voice should be listened to much more carefully, and their socioeconomic, demographic, and civilizational problems should be treated with more consideration as problems of global dimenision.

The valuable and lasting heritage of the developing countries is part of heritage of all mankind. Thus, it should be better known by us and properly evaluated. It concerns Europe in particular. The developing countries, which know from their own experience the essence of imperialist policy, have shown much friendliness, goodwill, and understanding toward Poland, in the most difficult period for us. They still demonstrate this. We in Poland appreciate it and we shall not forget it. Cooperation with them serves our common interests well. Wojciech Jaruzelski's visit to India, Libya, Algeria, and Tunisia was the most significant confirmation of this.

In our relations with these countries we aim, first and above all, at turning all the impetus resulting from those visits into concrete, measurable facts and processes. We have traditionally concentrated our attention on cooperation with India, consolidating and universally extending relations which link us with that country, and with friendly Arab countries such as Syria, Iraq, and Iran as well as with countries of socialist and progressive orientation.

We highly value our political, economic, and cultural links with the states of South America. We want to develop relations with Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Colombia, and other countries of that region in a versatile way. We traditionally attach great importance to relations of friendship and brotherhood with socialist Cuba.

Wojciech Jaruzelski's visit to Cuba in September 1985, as well as the signing of a program of cooperation, specialization, and socialist integration until the year 2000 by the leaders of the two countries were a creative impetus for the many-sided development of relations.

Increasing our presence in the countries of black Africa is considered to be an urgent need. We are aiming at complementing political relations with the developing countries with a greater intensification of economic cooperation. In our relations with those countries it is important, first and above all, to sonsolidate the belief of our partners that we consider mutual cooperation to be lasting and permament, and that we have a reliable attitude.

Poland has always highly regarded the Nonaligned Movement and its role in shaping the present international relations, and particularly its independent voice and intiatives in key issues for mankind relating to the preservation and consolidation of peace, and in acting against the arms race, neocolonialism, and racism. Our activity and stand on questions of local conflicts contributes to Poland's relations with the developing countries and with the Nonaligned Movement.

We invariably express our solidarity with the activities of Libya, a country to which we are joined by friendly, mutually beneficial relations in defense of its independence and sovereignty. We speak out resolutely against the economic restrictions adopted against Libya.

The war between Iraq and Iran arouses our anxiety and concern. We maintain good relations with these states and we want to develop them and give them a higher, political status. We are sincerely interested in an immediate end to armed activity, in the creation of lasting peace through negotiations.

The tragic events in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen arouse our deep anxiety. We support an immediate solution to this regrettable internal conflict through peaceful means and without external interference.

We are disturbed by the tension in the Middle East, caused by the aggressive Israeli policy -- supported by the United States -- in relation to the Arab states, with whom Poland is developing and strengthening friendly relations. Poland's stand is unchanging: that the condition for the regulation of the Middle East conflict is the withdrawal of Israel from Arab territories occupied in 1967; recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian nation, including the right to self-determination and the creation of an independent state; and the guarantee to all states of this region of the possibility for peaceful development within recognized borders.

We invariably point to the responsibility of those governments which give material aid and moral support to Israel, which give it courage, and which encourage it to continue the policy of aggression. The way to such a solution as that we have spoken about, should be through an international conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of all interested parties. Our attitudes to Israel and the character of contacts with Jewish circles all over the world are in strict accordance with this stance. For many centuries, the Polish nation coexisted with the Jewish nation. We have many mutual chapters in history. We remeber the immeasurable suffering and the enormity of the losses suffered by citizens of Jewish origin at the hands of the Hitlerite butchers. Throughout Poland there are scattered many places to the memory of Jewish martyrdom. In connection with this, we are prepared to create visa concessions between Poland and Israel, which in no way signifies an infringement of or change in our fundamental position in the matter of the Middle East.

May it please the house! We feel solidarity with the struggle of the Nicaraguan nation against the forces of counterrevolution, supported by U.S. imperialism. The policy of increasing tension in Central America and in other regions of the world is a serious threat to peace. It clouds the international atmosphere. We support the states of southern Africa, victims of political aggression from the Republic of South Africa. We condemn apartheid and all manifestations of racism.

May it please the house! Traditionally and for decades Poland has been conducting all-around activity in the system of international organizations and above all in the UN forum. In face of such a difficult and responsible international situation, what the entire world community needs now as never before is effective action by the United Nations for peace and security. We will support all initiatives and measures which strengthen its authority. An important subject of interest to Poland's foreign policy will continue to be building that authority. We want the United Nations to be an effective instrument for easing international tension, for extinguishing conflicts, for developing cooperation between peoples and states; to be a place of creative dialogue in the cause of preventing nuclear war, of disarmament, of rebuilding international trust and detente.

Poland takes a broad and active part in the celebrations of the International Peace Year proclaimed by the United Nations. Eloquent manifestation of this was the recently concluded Congress of Intellectuals in Defense of the Peaceful Future of the World in Warsaw. We are convinced that the ideas of the congress will inspire progressive forces in the world, and particularly intellectuals, to further struggle for abandoning force in international relations, for a halt to the arms race on earth, for preventing the implementation of plans for weapons in space, for the total elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the century.

The directions of our activity at the United Nations in 1986 are outlined by the peace initiatives of Mikhail Gorbachev; by the proposals by Wojceich Jaruzelski concerning the compilation of a study on the consequences of militarization of space; the creation of an international research center on debt and development, and the adoption of the general principle of free flow of experiments, licenses, and technologies promoting environmental protection. We will strive for the implementation of these proposals and for the expansion of the group of their supporters.

May it please the house! It is the obligation of foreign policy and the institutions which implement it to shape an honest, true picture of Poland abroad; to overcome unfriendly patterns in the reception and assessment of our country's problems. The conviction emerges from the character of our policy that an essential condition for cooperation among peoples and states with different systems of government and of values is to get to know each other.

To coexist and cooperate peacefully we must get to know each other better, understand each other's problems and attitudes, in spite of all the differences which divide us. By making known the true picture of Poland, its real problems and aspirations, we don't hide -- and will not do so -- the entire complexity of the situation of the state and people. However, we wish that others -- in the West, and across the ocean -- would see Poland with all its problems and achievements, its bright and dark spots, and first of all which decides its today and tomorrow.

In shaping the picture of Poland an extremely important role has been played by culture, its promotion abroad in traditional regions, and absorbing new territories of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. This is the duty of Polish foreign policy. In this field much remains to be done, from the program of promoting Polish culture, to the coordination of a great many organizations and institutes, and the concentration of resources which are not as small as sometimes said but which are not always properly managed.

Making way for the most excellent achievements of Polish culture and in favoring cultural exchange, we will act firmly against using culture and culture exchange as an instrument of destabilization of internal relations in Poland, in spreading the patronage of anti-Polish and anticommunist centers in the West to the antisystem opposition in Poland.

An object of constant concern for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is concern for Polish citizens abroad and the consolidation of links between various Polish centers abroad with the mother country.

We are all glad that more and more Poles living abroad show growing confidence in Poland; the noisy campaigns conducted by hostile groups linked with antisocialist opposition at home have been unable to undermine that confidence.

The anti-Polish propaganda operation in the main centers of Poles living abroad has also failed. It is our aim and desire to inspire those people to patriotic involvement in the most vital affairs of the Polish nation in the consolidation of spiritual and cultural bonds with the mother country, the popularization of a realistic assessment of Polish affairs among millions of people of Polish origin abroad. All Poles in all countries of the world are in the field of our interest. We will not forget any one of them.

May it please the house! The foreign policy of our state is in the center of attention of our entire nation.

It expresses the hopes, ambitions and strivings of all its social and political forces who have Poland's raison d'etat at heart. We are a people with an extensive political imagination, open to the world. Imagination and openness, linked with bitter historical experiences, dictate and give rise to an activeness in relation to the world. We understand as a people that the drama in Lebanon or South Yemen, the tragic war between Iraq and Iran, the invasion of Grenada, the support for counterrevolution in Nicaragua are a threat to the entire globe and to Poland as well. Awareness of the close interdependence of the fate of Poland and the fate of the world is the source of the involvement and emotional attitude of Poles to the foreign policy conducted by the state.

Foreign policy is a great causative force and one of the broad planes of national accord. Despite differences, Poles are united by pride in their own country and sincere desire that it should take its rightful place in the community of nations. A reflection of this is the constructive cooperation in foreign policy by all forces which accept the constitutional realities of the Polish People's Republic, which recognize that the lasting nature of the national existence, the successful today and tomorrow of the nation, the secure and sovereign existence of the state, its role in Europe and the world stand above all differences of interest and opinion.

In the creation and implementation of Polish foreign policy, a decisive role in the system of government of our state falls to the leading force of society, the PZPR. In this process, an active and creative part is played by the allied parties as well, by the ZSL, and by the SD, and by the Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth. Its voice on the vital issues of Polish foreign policy is increasingly strong. It is bearing fruit in initiatives and measures extending the planes and scope of national accord. It is the intention and the will of the PZPR and its allies to consolidate and extend this process.

In achieving the goals of Polish foreign policy together with the specialist bodies of the state administration, the political parties, the youth organizations, the trade unions and women's organizations, and other social organizations are increasingly taking part. Among them are a growing number of international friendship organizations. The patriotic participation of many representatives of the Catholic Church and of other denominations in building Poland's international standing, in defending its good name, in opposing illegal restrictions and discriminatory practices, is valuable and worthy of recognition. We greatly regret that the call of John Paul II, the Polish Pope, that the call of the primate of Poland for the lifting of restrictions has remained without a response in the place to which it was addressed.

May it please the house! In our foreign policy we shall use, more than we have so far, the capabilities of other political parties [stronnictwa polityczne], social organizations -- including the associations of lay Catholics -- and the recognized authorities and artists who usually have lively foreign contacts. The entire nation can participate in the shaping and implementing of foreign policy.

The social consultation before Wojciech Jaruzelski's speech in the United Nations proved it. This new form of cooperation with society, which reflects the practical possibility of its participation in articulating Poland's stand toward the problems of the contemporary world, has again proved the Poles' unanimity in the issues of peace and international cooperation. At the same time it has revealed a keen interest in foreign policy issues which we shall consolidate and use.

The statement that the whole nation participates in the shaping and implementing of foreign policy is an obligation for us, and it demands reliable information on foreign policy and its conditions and problems. It is an obligation to stimulate the curiosity of the younger generations in the complexity of the world and the dilemmas of its development. It is an obligation to shape the national sensitivity for the fate of other nations, as well as our own national pride and dignity which are so indispensable when one is outside one's own country, when one naturally has to represent one's country.

The national nature of our foreign policy and the way of outlining its aims and directions are expressed particularly in the Sejm. The Sejm's activity for Polish foreign policy and its own activity in international forums are unceasing proof of this. By performing its constittutional functions, acting for the preservation of peace and universal security and disarmament, intensifying relations with the parliaments of other countries, developing cooperation with them which serves to protect Polands's political, economic, and cultural interests, breaking barriers and isolations created by Poland's opponents, the Sejm as a whole as well as its commissions, and the Commission for Foreign Affairs in particular, the deputies clubs and circles, the Polish Interparliamentary Group, and the deputies bilateral group play a great role in Polish foreign policy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has always had the support and cooperation of the Sejm and its commissions, the Commission for Foreign Affairs in particular.

I thank the Sejm speaker and the citizen deputies for this. I express hope and conviction that this fruitful cooperation will not only be lasting but also will be enriched adequately to meet the challenges brough to Polish foreign policy by the present era, which is full of threats and dangers but also full of opportunities and hopes. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is by law the main executor and coordinator of the state's foreign policy. It is the ministry's duty to implement and put into practice its assumptions and aims. It is responsible for the actions of various ministries, offices, and citizens in various sectors which, by way of various means, are channelled into one stream of Polish foreign policy. The character of the tasks, their variety and mutual dependence in political, economic and financial, and cultural fields, and the treaties and information and propaganda sphere demand a constant improvement of the coordinating function of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It must adapt its forms and methods of operation to changing conditions, and a more careful selection of cadres and training.

Workers of the Polish foreign service withstood the test of ideological and political endurance during the hardest years, 1980-81, and during the period of martial law. They have passed the difficult test today with their devoted and fully involved effort. I would like express my appreciation and gratitude to them on behalf of the government.

At the same time, having consideration for the authority of the Polish foreign service, we will remove from its ranks all those who are unable to meet its essential ideological and political demands. We will rejuvenate its cadres, award initiative, courage, and devotion, and raise ideological and political and professional qualifications.

May it please the house! On 27 September last year Wojciech Jaruzelski said in the United Nations: Poland threatens no one, and we expect that no one will threaten it. We have ensured for it an appropriate place in the family of nations, a guarantee of the independence and territorial integrity of a sovereign state. No wise nation would squander such a gain. We judge the past soberly and we look confidently into the future.

In these words is the essence of our intentions and efforts toward the rest of the world. We are the friends of all nations; we can be relied upon as an ally, our word can be trusted, and our partnership can be counted upon. As a sovereign state, strong and stable, we have the right to be treated as an equal among equals. We want a secure Europe, a world free from threats. We have been doing everything to save peace on earth, for the good of Poland, for its flourishing and for a successful tomorrow.

LATE REPORT: SHUTTLE CREW 'PARTICIPANTS' IN SDI

AU311159 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI in Polish 29 Jan 86 p 2

[Janusz Sarosiek commentary: "Tragic Haste"]

[Text] Shortly after the end of the Apollo program the shuttle program was born, in great secrecy and costing three times as much as the moon program. It involved a reusable space vehicle, a space ferry, which is well-known today. The first of a series of four such vehicles was Columbia. Barely 1 week ago this oldest space vehicle ended a mission that had to be aborted 24 hours before the end because of technical problems. The launch itself had been postponed many times. It was delayed by several weeks because there were always some "gremlins," irregularities and trivialities which could have caused a disaster.

Yesterday, at 1738 hours Polish time and about 1 and 1/2 minutes after the launch of the subsequent American shuttle Challenger, the greatest tragedy in the history of space flight occurred. There was an explosion, probably in one of the shuttle's engines, which in turn caused the huge liquid hydrogen tank to explode. The entire crew of seven, including two women, died. The disaster shocked the entire world. Radio and television stations interrupted their normal programs to report the tragedy. One may regard it as the price to be paid for technological progress. The history of our civilization has recorded many tragedies involving pioneers who tried to perfect the still imperfect work of human hands and who, fully aware of the risk they were taking, sat down behind the joystick of primitive flying machines. They reached unattainable heights and depths. They conquered the cold of arctic regions and the heat of deserts. The lives of these pioneers were sacrificed at the altar of progress for the sake of peace and the good of mankind. But the death of seven American astronauts cannot be included in the same category. The tragedy of these people, of their families, and of all those who prepared Challenger's last flight in good faith is a shock to us. Whether they were aware of it or not, these people were nevertheless participants in a program meant to permit the domination of space for the sake of a future victory during a confrontation on earth, a program in which the shuttles have been used as perfect tools for implementing the SDI plans -- President Reagan's "star wars."

After the remnants of Challenger had sunk in the ocean, President Reagan, despite his profound shock, failed to announce any alteration to the shuttle program. White House spokesman Larry Speakes said that this accident "will not stop the United States from implementing the space exploration program." We know only too well what this "exploration" program is. It has been said officially that 20 percent of the shuttle flights are reserved exclusively for military purposes.

But out of the 25 missions so far, only a few have been purely civilian in nature. Even during the two so-called European test flights, Americans tried out some of the equipment foreseen for future "star wars". This involved complete satellite reconnaissance stations, telescopes meant to seek out targets and focus laser beams on them, and investigations of how to shoot laser beams from earth to space and vice versa.

Officially, the tragic flight of Challenger was supposed to investigate Halley's comet, but no one doubts that this would have been too insignificant and too extravagant a purpose for the huge cost of such a mission. History will soon reveal for what cause seven heroic astronauts gave their lives.

With four shuttles at its disposal, Washington expected unusually rapid progress in investigating space, especially the military uses thereof. But instead of the 30 flights per year that had been planned, the American space agency NASA has only been able to prepare an average of one launch every 8 weeks. NASA blamed its misfortune on inanimate objects. It was difficult to expect the sponsors and controllers of the military program to calmly tolerate such a delay. Hence a certain haste and anxiety has been visible in NASA's work lately. Some missions were curtailed to permit the earlier launch of subsequent ones. Launches were postponed and the order of flights changed. The problem of emergency landing sites for the shuttles was solved in a hurry. The Pentagon's space mission staff is working flat out, which has a negative effect on the safety of shuttle flights.

A nervous atmosphere serves no cause, not even in NASA. After this catastrophe, will the White House draw conclusions from Mikhail Gorbachev's far-reaching disarmament proposals? Will it give up the race to dominate space after the loss of seven astronauts and a vehicle worth millions? Instead of confrontation, will it take this opportunity to seek ways of cooperation and accord, in space as well? One can multiply questions like this, but the answer to them still cannot be unequivocally in the affirmative. It is worth casting one's mind back to the time of the joint Soyuz-Apollo flight, which could have been the start of joint space rescue operations between both powers. It is worth remembering that the January 1967 tragedy, when three astronauts were incinerated in an Apollo ship, would not have happened if the Americans had taken advantage of Soviet experience and filled the cabin with a Soviet mixture of air instead of pure oxygen.

The many tragedies have not been in vain. Thus this one, too, may serve a good cause. For it teaches us that one cannot be too careful. It shows that not even the United States has the technology to avoid a tragic accident. Here it is worth mentioning the fears expressed by American scientists belonging to the Group of Concerned Scientists and shared by Soviet leader M. Gorbachev whereby at a time of increased space rocket launches and "star war" preparations, and accidental explosion could be mistaken for an attack. The whole of mankind could be the victim of such an error. Let us hope that the crew of Challenger did not die in vain and that haste dictated by the arms race in space will never again be the cause of a similar tragedy.

LCY'S VIDIC EXAMINES GORBACHEV ARMS PROPOSALS

AU300922 Belgrade POLITIKA in Serbo-Croatian 22 Jan 86 p 2

[Dobrivoje Vidic article: "Between Reality and Dream"]

[Text] Apart from creating a new climate in relations between the United States and the USSR, the basic result of the Geneva meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev is exactly the orientation noted in the joint statement against a war between these countries, because such a war, bound to be nuclear, would lead to general catastrophe.

It is clear that this orientation is of the greatest significance for the entire world situation, provided that practical measures are taken with a view to securing it.

Reaganite actual policy [konkretizacija] is leading into "star wars" as a subject matter, along with a continuation of negotiations about problems now being discussed at various places.

Before us now is a new Soviet proposal submitted by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Gorbachev, which contains phased measures aimed at a complete liquidation of nuclear arms by the end of the century.

President Reagan is said to have had a dream about the development of new defense weapons that will make nuclear weapons obsolete. Since then, a comprehensive debate on the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative has been held in the world.

The main argument against the development of those new weapons and systems states that it will not lead to the liquidation of nuclear arms, that it will not have a solely defensive, but also an offensive character, and that, together with the stockpiles of nuclear arms, it is meant for attaining the advantage and being used with a view to inflicting a first strike. These are also the bases of the Soviet demand that militarization of space is not allowed and that an international agreement on this be reached.

Gorbachev's new proposal links the abandonment of SDI with a course toward an internationally agreed elimination of nuclear weapons to be carried out soon. Some say that the former is a condition for the latter. It does not have to be so. That is a matter for negotiation.

With the appearance of nuclear arms, there came views that the control of the development of those arms must be urgently ensured through international agreements, and proposals that one should abandon the production of those arms at the very beginning of the nuclear era and (also urgently) start eliminating them. Nothing came of that. The only thing attained was an agreement on banning tests which is not all-inclusive; therefore, the Nonaligned Movement now demands that all tests of those arms be stopped.

The Value of Proposals

The much-publicized Gorbachev plan, as an idea and an approach, is not new. During the fifties and the sixties, world statesmen in the UN organization even officially suggested a course toward general and complete disarmament that would include all types of weapons and would be carried out under strict international control.

That was the time when the threat of a nuclear war was not so intensive and the quality and quantity of those weapons was not what it is today. This is why Gorbachev's proposal represents a major event in the present international relations and circumstances, because it fully takes into consideration the scientific reports about the destructiveness of these weapons and the danger they present to the world, and it actually starts from the general demands that the possibility of a nuclear war be completely and permanently removed.

The value of these proposals is in their being socially explainable and suitable for international negotiations.

The proposal gains in realism by meeting the demands of other nuclear powers that the process of nuclear disarmament should start from the United States and the USSR, that the potentials are thereby equalized at a certain stage of their reduction, and that the process be jointly continued until the end.

As regards the world public, it is natural that corresponding orientations will arise in this respect. In this world on the brink of nuclear catastrophe, pressures will grow that nothing which contains a possibility for intensifying the conditions of world peace should be rejected.

It goes without saying that the militaristically oriented circles, particularly those who have always shown their anticommunist inclinations, will find reasons to be against that.

That should not be confused with remarks that may come from certain governments and their analytical offices.

One should presume that a debate will open about who will gain an advantage and what kind of advantage when (if) nuclear disarmament is achieved, because Gorbachev's plan does not directly deal with conventional weapons. This is a constant topic in current international conditions as well. One tries to justify military bases and presence of troops on foreign territories by assessing that advantage. It is exactly from that assessment, which most frequently says that the USSR, as a huge continental power, has the advantage, that a basis is drawn for claims that European countries, for instance, are being endangered. In doing so, one completely ignores other approaches and assessments.

It could be expected that the development of nuclear weapons would have accelerated the process of reducing a standing army and its deployment. That has not happened. The period of the cold war and the political aims of the military-political blocs made it impossible, and the very existence and development of nuclear arms were not a sufficient argument for that since one cannot occupy territories with nuclear arms.

Therefore, the aims of international negotiations on the decrease in and possible essential reduction of all forms of conventional armament, as well as chemical and biological weapons, will gain in importance and parallel urgency in relation to Gorbachev's proposals.

More Courage

It is therefore more than good that these proposals stress that the negotiations underway in Geneva, Vienna, Stockholm, and other UN organs should be continued, and that all present proposals being discussed there are still in force. One could say that it will be necessary also in this sphere of negotiating, that there is by far more courage and new approaches, which would make the process of actual agreement easier.

When taking positions on Gorbachev's proposals -- also in the case of the proposals of the Nonaligned Movement or other constructive proposals -- all those who underestimate the "ordinary man," those who think that citizens of the world are not capable of arriving at their own assessments of everything pertaining to their direct interests, will be wrong. Besides, working people and citizens everywhere are today more organized and are not left to themselves and to their (lonely) resourcefulness.

The course of the arms race in fact simultaneously incites a silent militarization of social relations in all countries where it is intensively present. The existing tensions are also justified by it. A course toward real disarmament therefore has the greatest progressive significance also from the point of view of the development of free human relations. It will render meaningless the present obstacles to free communications among nations and the use of force in political relations, lead to the overcoming and dissolving military-political relations, lead to the overcoming and dissolving military-political blocs, and will bring the world to the level of the real practice of active peaceful coexistence. All this will work, it goes without saying, only under the condition that it is realized. The world of science and industry will be able to devote itself completely to the peaceful use of nuclear energy and to permanently solving the basic energy problems of humanity, which would bring people huge benefit.

Under the condition that its realization is agreed upon, this course will make possible the gradual reorientation of wartime to peacetime production, free huge resources, and ease the solution of the most difficult world economic problems.

The new Gorbachev proposal must by no means be declared unfeasible or dismissed as propaganda, because its realization runs parallel to the basic needs of all peoples, which was shown by all UN sessions dealing with those topics held to date, and all summits and activities of the Nonaligned Movement.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATION DEBATES CRITICAL ANALYSIS

AU301900 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1400 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] A session of the Federal Council Presidium of the Federation of Veterans' Associations of Yugoslavia has discussed the Critical Analysis of the Functioning of the Political System of Socialist Self-Management. Mijusko Tomic reports:

The debate held by the veterans' activists today was actually a criticism of the Critical Analysis. The book was worked on and has been published, it was said, without any connection with economic and social reality. This was pointed out by Mihailo Svabic at the beginning of the debate. According to him, one started from some sort of isolated reality that the system should serve. Muhamed Kesetovic stressed that the way this document was approached could not have given any result different from the one it has given -- a functionally-positivist and not Marxist-dialectical one in the methodological sense of the word. He goes on to say the following:

[Begin Kesetovic recording] Such an approach is strongly criticized everywhere today, because that is a method actually used by bureaucracy throughout the world with a view to firming its positions and (?power). In that respect, I would dare say that it is a great mistake in a certain way to offer such a methodological approach to the LCY.

When I say so, I also mean that the right question of the relation of forces in society is the attitude of bureaucracy and technocracy toward the workers class and its social and material position and its social role, and not relations between norms and institutions. [end recording]

To what extent the analysis suits the spirit of the revolution and the current difficult time in the country, to what extent it gives an answer to the disunity of the country and system, and to the decisive say of the workers class, was asked by Vlado Scekic, Roade Aleksic, Andrija Milanovic, Jure Ivezic, Dane Petkovski, Petar Brajovic, Svetozar Oro, Dusan Korac, and Ivica Gretic.

One cannot see from the analysis -- and that was something it should have done at the beginning -- what are the theoretical and methodological bases the Critical Analysis started from, what are its essential aims, most important criteria, and indexes on the basis of which one arrived at the assessments presented, it was pointed out at this session of veterans' activists.

More on Debate

AU302011 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1800 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] The Critical Analysis of the Functioning of the Political System of Socialist Self-Management was the topic of debate at the veterans' activists meeting held today. That debate actually involved criticism of the Critical Analysis. Mijusko Tomic reports:

Muhamed Kesetovic thinks that the way the document was approached could not have given any result different from the one it has given -- a functionalist-positivist and not a Marxist-dialectic one:

[Begin Kesetovic recording] In essence, this document deals with fight between two currents in our political system: one being the current advocating the status quo and another the radical one that would, I am sure, with a radical phrase deny almost everything that is offered to it. I feel an irresistible urge to say the following from this veterans' rostrum: We are responsible for the revolution that we fought for and relations in society today, both to history and to the generations that will value us according to our behavior and attitude toward this document. Our responsibility is not to raise our hands in support of something, including this document -- irrespective of the institutional authorities who are behind it -- but for the revolution and the system, in the context of the relations established in society. The dominance of bureaucracy and [word indistinct] over the workers class -- something which actually reflects the distribution and relations of forces in the society and system -- has had and is having disastrous results. [end recording]

Vladimir Scekic asked to what extent the Critical Analysis corresponds to the spirit of the revolution and the current difficult time in the country, bearing in mind the disunity of the country and system.

[Begin Scekic recording] To what extent does it provide answers and solutions to this disunity of the country, and, if you will, the entire system? The system is broken. To what extent do the associated labor and the workers class in this country have crucial influence and a decisive say, something which would have to exist according to program and constitution?

Why is this so? Why does the Critical Analysis fail to give that? Why does it not give answers to that situation, to these essential questions that shake the country, questions on disunity, on quarrels, divisions, encapsulations of the whole of the social life in all its spheres?

The focus and causes of all those problems are in republican-provincial statist monopolies, the strong centers of power, and one does not want to deprive them of power. And as long as there are such centers, there is no unity of Yugoslavia. That is an administration over the federation, a power over the federation, and one does not want to lose that power. [end recording]

ZARKOVIC OUTLINES CONGRESS PREPARATIONS

LD302343 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1430 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Belgrade, 30 Jan (TANJUG) -- Overcoming the economic crisis and opening up prospects for the country's further dynamic economic development, the further development of socialist self-management and the removal of the causes that have led to the slow-down and deformation of this development, as well as strengthening the role of the subjective factor -- especially the LC -- in our system, should be the focus of attention of the forthcoming 13th LCY Congress. In order to make progress on this in the precongress preparations and at the congress itself, we must answer the question of why, between the two congresses, there was a period of economic crisis, burdened with major difficulties in overall social development and in the LCY's work. There must be a comprehensive explanation of all the processes and events and of our own responsibility in all this, said Vidoje Zarkovic, president of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, in a talk with directors and chief editors of the domestic information media.

In the talks -- in which Dimce Belovski, secretary of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, and Marko Lolic and Stanislav Stojanovic, executive secretaries of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, also took part -- the preparations for the 13th LCY Congress and for the LC congresses and conferences in the republics and provinces, and the tasks of the public media in connection with this, were discussed.

Vidoje Zarkovic talked about the activities of the LCY Central Committee and his term as president up to the congress. At this moment, one of the most important tasks is certainly the preparation of draft congress documents. Preliminary drafts of four basic resolutions have already been put together and by the end of this month, the Central Committee will determine draft versions of them and put them up for public discussion. We expect, said Zarkovic, that by that time, separate resolutions will also be ready on young people, human rights, the realization of a political platform on Kosovo, and on education and training. The preliminary drafts of some resolutions are detailed, but they contain the main problems and activity guidelines for their solution. Due to the little time remaining for public debate, Zarkovic stressed, it is necessary to concentrate attention on the assessments and the policy they are offering, and not on every individual formulation. Basic LC organizations and municipal, central, and provincial LC committees should form their views on the essence of the proposed policy.

Draft reports on the work of the LCY and the LCY Central Committee between two congresses, and the draft LCY Statute on which the Central Committee will make a statement as early as the next session, have also been completed.

However significant the preparation of congress documents has been, our work simply cannot be reduced to that, stressed Vidoje Zarkovic. The most important part of the precongress preparations must be the increased efforts of Communists and working people to implement the stand we have adopted on numerous questions and to solve some very acute problems. According to Zarkovic, the Central Committee will devote special attention in the coming 5 months to implementing the conclusions adopted on the key social problems: an anti-inflation program, economic relations with foreign countries, implementing the constitutional conception of the federation, employment, the medium-term plan, the resolution for this year, and other things. All these conclusions and documents must be the framework and agreed basis -- the social and political platform so to speak -- in which all social subjects from the basic organization of associated labor to the highest state and party organs must be involved.

These tasks, observed Zarkovic, cannot be implemented without the broadest activity of working people and citizens to increase exports, production for export, the harmonization of all forms of consumption, greater savings, increased productivity, etc. Through overall political and propaganda activity, it should be more strongly emphasized that in society there is much economic, business, and social potential that is unsatisfactorily exploited, from working hours and capacity to craftmanship skills and agricultural land.

The president of the LCY Central Committee Presidium went on in his address to devote special attention to society's insufficient concern on matters of the erosion of morals. Each attack on social property, Zarkovic stated, was an attack on the bases of our system. Individuals who have violated the law in such matters should be punished in an exemplary manner. The best preventive measure is an efficient sanction and a sharp and public moral condemnation. In our society thieves should be afraid. It is worrying, he added, that among the perpetrators of such acts there are LC members. As a party, we have a principled and politically clear line of demarcation on unacceptable phenomena and behavior, but the LC, in practice, is nowhere near fighting amoral phenomena in our society hard enough, as it should and must. The information media could make a great contribution to the struggle against unsocialist phenomena. But, warned Zarkovic, they must be on their guard against extremism, onesidedness, and the dissemination of lies about anyone whatsoever.

One of the central topics in the precongress preparations will also be the functioning of the political system. Stating that the focus of activity must be the removal of weaknesses noted in the functioning of the political system, Zarkovic pointed to some attempts to belittle the whole of the Critical Analysis. Although some of the issues are only partially touched upon [nedorecen], the majority of the solutions are good, he stressed.

The present socioeconomic and political situation in the country demands a complete discussion in the LC on youth, on its social and life position, on occurrences and processes within it, and on our attitude toward the young generation. The starting point here is the obvious necessity of the LC to struggle for the greater affirmation of young people in all areas of social life; for the greater participation and greater responsibility of young people in decisionmaking on social problems and on their own problems, as well as in the struggle for the development of socialist self-management relations. The LCY Central Committee session, at which there will be discussion of these questions, should provide an answer as to which and what kind of tasks the LC faces in regard to the greater social affirmation of young people.

In view of the fact that recently in public and within the LC as well, there have been many generalizations and extremely different diagnoses, it is essential, said Zarkovic, that the LCY Central Committee assess the real ideopolitical mood and trend within the young generation. Starting from the recognition that we will prevent and suppress all undesired phenomena and tendencies (?towards) the awareness and social involvement of young people, above all by solving those socioeconomic problems which most directly affect the young generation, the Central Committee will not discuss these questions at only one session. A separate resolution will be adopted for the 13th LCY Congress, which will contain the fundamental tasks of Communists in the realization of the social position of the young generation.

Our society, after a stormy and dynamic development, has experienced stagnation not only economically but also in the development of socialist self-management, and the development of ideas and thoughts, for which it was previously known throughout the world. It is absolutely no surprise, observed Zarkovic, that those who are hostile towards the LC are exploiting this stagnation. We will meet enemies in the future as well, but we should be more concerned about our own slowness in solving these problems and the fact that in the circumstances of stagnation a number of people who support self-management and the LCY policy are beginning to lose faith in the LC and the system. Our information media and some political workers, instead of helping these people, instead of explaining to them the essence of our difficulties, are behaving in such a way as to add oil to the fire and are beginning to act in an altogether destructive manner.

In this situation, individuals are emerging both in the party and also in the information media who believe that the most important thing is to criticize as much as possible. Criticism, said Zarkovic, should not be held back; elaborate praises ought not to be written, especially about things which do not deserve it. At the same time, however, faith should not be lost in an awareness about which direction we should go in and what we should fight for. A distinction must be drawn between pseudo-criticism and despair.

Speaking of the place and role of the information media, Zarkovic stressed their irreplaceable function in initiating social actions. Without them, he said, it is virtually impossible to mobilize the broadest masses to demonstrate their own huge power and creativity, which we need precisely at this moment. The LC is expecting and asking of its members in the LC organizations in the newspaper and publishing, radio and TV houses, to make a contribution to the implementation of the policy decided upon, by their overall editorial orientation and in each text and contribution. You should support, stimulate, and give emphasis to examples of successful operation, and counter all "brakes on change" in the basic direction of our self-managing development. The majority of our information media, Zarkovic assessed, act in this way and attain good results. A part of them, however, are resisting this and continue to support a different journalistic position and succumb to liberalism and nationalism.

We expect that you will not succumb to the pressures of local and other passions and that you will not have two standards -- one for your own and another for the rest of the environment. You are a significant active part of the front of our ideological battles and no one can free you from this. But, Zarkovic added, we must do more so that you do not remain alone for a long time or have the whole burden of ideological struggles shifted onto you alone, which sometimes happens.

It is particularly important that nationalism, which is the most malignant thing for our overall social system, does not penetrate into our public media. Indeed, where the nationalists are strong, Communists are bad and inactive, said Zarkovic.

Finally, the president of the LCY Central Committee Presidium informed directors and chief editors about the international activities of the LCY in the preparations for the 13th LCY Congress. He said that a large number of representatives of parties, and progressive and liberation movements with which the LCY cooperates, would be invited to the congress.

TRADE DEFICIT REDUCED; CREDIT OBLIGATIONS MET

LD301032 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1921 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Text] Belgrade, January 29 (TANJUG) -- Yugoslavia has met all its foreign credit obligations for January this year, amounting to a total of 588 million dollars, Yugoslav National Bank Vice-Governor Nikola Mrkic told the Foreign Economic Relations Committee of the Assembly of Yugoslavia Chamber of Republics and Provinces today.

The immediate obligations to foreign creditors were met in accordance with a list of priorities drawn up by the Yugoslav Government.

The value of Yugoslav deliveries to foreign buyers for the first 27 days of January this year stood at 646 million dollars, or was up 18 percent on the same period last year. The value of purchases abroad amounted to 804 million dollars, or 92 percent of the value recorded in January last year. As a result, the Yugoslav trade deficit was cut by 261 million dollars, and now stands at around 159 million.

CONDITIONS PLACED ON EXPORT, IMPORT FIRMS

LD302146 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2021 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Belgarade, January 30 (TANJUG) -- Yugoslav export-import enterprises will in future be able to continue this activity only on condition that 30 per cent at least of their overall external trade are realized through exports whose value cannot be less than 30 million dollars per annum, the Yugoslav Government decided today.

The above decision, adopted in keeping with the law on goods and services trade, specifies that only those Yugoslav enterprises which undertake the obligation of exporting to foreign persons they represent in Yugoslavia Yugoslav-made goods worth at least 50 per cent of their commission fee for representing the foreign persons will be able to represent the latter. The Yugoslav enterprises are also obliged to have organized consignment stocks with spare parts and repair and maintenance service.

It is cited that Yugoslav enterprises will be able to perform border trade only if their annual exports amount to one million dollars at least.